THE SPIRIT AND STRUGGLE OF ISLAM

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The Gospel of Freedom

The Secret of Asia

Sri Krishna

India in Chains

My Motherland

THE SPIRIT AND STRUGGLE OF ISLAM

BY

PROF. T. L. VASWANI

ললিত মোহন লাইব্রেরী
স্থাপিত ১১৩৯
নদীয়া –

GANESH & Co., MADRAS

1921

RK

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Foreword	vii
The New Temple	1
India and Islam	4
Vital Values of Islam	11
Islam and Imperialism	22
The Genius of Islam	30
The Way of Sacrifice	39
Peaceful Penetration	42
The Agony of Islam	52
The Khilafat and the Task of To-day	62
Hindu-Muslim Unity	69
One Fellowship	76
A Fragment from a Scholar-Patriot	83
Concerning Khilafat	92
The Message of Unity	96
The Situation and Sind Muslims	103
The Challenge to Islam	108
The Muslim Mood	111
A Call to Solidarity	114
To My Muslim Friends	119
A Muslim Empire Builder	136
A Mockery of International Morality	146
Together We Rise or Together We Fall	150
Will Repression Work?	169

P. Majumdar

FOREWORD

I AM not a politician. I am not a Muslim. I am not a Pan-Islamist. But I regard patriotism as a sacred thing, and defence of national dignity as our *dharma*. I believe profoundly in the value of Hindu-Muslim unity for achieving national freedom. I am not frightened by Pan-Islamism. Once Hindu-Muslim unity is secure, Pan-Islam will rather act as a powerful ally of India in protecting her against western imperialisms.

The essays and addresses which the publishers have brought together in this volume indicate my appreciation of the deeper values of Islam and my anxiety at the present situation created by the greed and diplomacy of the 'Great Powers'. To wrong Islam is to wrong India and the East. And as long as Islam lies wounded, as it does to-day, the Orient will be in the grip of aggressive, exploiting imperialisms of the West. To help the Khilafat by all non-violent methods is, I believe, to help the East to guard her cultures and civilisations against Europe's materialism and *real politic*. In a sense, indeed, the Khilafat movement is a protest

of Asia against Europe, and the movement will succeed or fail according as it is or is not loyal to the Spirit of Asia. That spirit, as I understand it, is *spiritual idealism.*

In the light of that spirit have I sought to interpret some aspects of Islam and the Khilafat issue in India. Had circumstances permitted I should have added two chapters, one on "Sufism," the other on "The Message of Mahomed". I am hoping to be able to devote a separate volume to these and some other aspects of Islam. It is time to abandon crude conceptions of the Islamic ideal—an ideal which has been a shaping power in East and West. Guizot and Draper had the frankness to admit that Islam freed Europe from feudalism. And did not Islam exert an uplifting influence on mediæval Europe? Long before the French Revolution, Islam gave to the nations a message of liberty, equality and fraternity. It is customary to run down the Moghuls and the Moghul rule in India; an English critic thinks the Moghuls were no better than 'a plague in the course of human progress'. And how silent are our 'text books' concerning the virtues of the Moghuls and the services they rendered to

art and architecture, to literature and the life of India! Two of the papers in this collection, "A Moghul Empire-Builder" and "India and Islam," suggest a thought or two in this direction. In my paper on "Vital Values of Islam" and "The Genius of Islam" I have indicated a few things bearing upon the services of Islam to Europe and the message of Islamic culture to the modern world. That the Islamic ideal has a value for us to-day is what I have learnt to understand more and more as I have studied the subject. Again and again has Islam produced men and women of profound knowledge—men who, having reached a stage of illumination and ecstasy, have sung songs and lived lives which have, I believe, an "eternal" meaning for the human race. What a profound philosophy of life is in the lyrics they have left—the lyrics which sing of the nightingale and the rose, the moth and the candle, the camel and the desert, the lover and the lake—lyrics of Laila and Majanu, Sasui and Punuh, Umer and Marui, Yusuf and Zulaika; lyrics of the soul's longing for the Love that makes the world, for all its struggles and sufferings, a wonder and a vision of mystery.

I have tried to study the Khilafat controversy with as little prejudice against Europe as possible. And I am constrained to say that the Allies have not played an open game. The whole world spoke straight to Germany when she invaded Belgium. But the West is silent when the "Big Powers" invade the Muslim East. Indeed, there are Christians in Europe who regard the partition of Turkey (an act of international burglary in the East) as "a kind of crusade or holy war, the final struggle of Christian civilisation against Asiatic barbarism"! I have wished to show that Islam represents *not* barbarism but that spiritual idealism which is the very heart of Asia. The Orient, alas! is become, to-day, a battle-ground of the "Big Powers" for "zones of influence"—for imperialisms of exploitation and commerce which are, I think, more cruel than were the imperialisms of Alexander and Rome. If Islam becomes an agent of Destiny to overthrow imperialism, it will have done much for India and the East. Thinkers like Lord Haldane may speak of the 'Empire' becoming "a living combination of independent Commonwealths". But the East knows that

Europe's imperialisms are dominated by materialistic ideals; and *if the coming revolution in the East does not itself become materialistic,* the East will win once more a victory over the West and purify the life of the nations.

Europe seems to be in no mood, at present, to repent of its sins against Islam and the East. Greece is imitating the 'Big Powers'; Greece is developing a Hellenic imperialism; Greece has its designs upon Asia Minor and Constantinople. A 'prophecy' of a 'Greek priest' is running round Greece! 'His fame as a prophet' we are told, 'has spread throughout Greece' and he 'has made some remarkably correct predictions.' "He foretold the European war a month before the outbreak; predicted the wresting of Jerusalem from the Turks; the death of King Alexander; the duration of the Venezelist regime; and the return of Constantinople to the throne. And he declares that before the end of October, 1921, Constantine XIV at the head of his army will enter the Turkish capital!" "The present King Constantine," it is explained, "is the first of Greece, but the 14th of the Byzantine Empire." The Greek 'prophet' adds: "At

the moment of Constantine's triumph something terrible will befall him." This, we are told, seems to "presage the death of the king in the hour of victory". Constantine believes it all, and is reported to have said: "Let me once enter Constantinople, I don't care what happens to me afterwards!" Constantine's words represent, in a way, the mood of Europe's imperialisms; they must dominate the East; they don't care what happens afterwards!

Count Le'on Ostrorog warned the Allies in his "*Le Probleme Turc*" that "anything in the nature of a partition of the Ottoman Empire and any subjection of Muslim territory to Christian domination can only mean for the future a continuation of ancient feuds and of present troubles". The Allies have partitioned Turkey. And the result? Crisis in India—war and devastation in the East. The British Government is still unwilling to come to terms with Islam. It believes in diplomacy when the problem must be handled in a spirit of fairplay. The Indian Government talks of conciliation, but has launched a policy of rigorous repression. The Ali Brothers, Dr. Kitchlew and others are arrested. Government commits a

big blunder if it thinks the arrests of Khilafatists and Non-co-operation leaders and workers will extinguish Muslim or Indian nationalism. How often have I not thought of several young Sindhis, Muslims and Hindus, treated to-day as felons in the jails! They have the hearts of patriots; that is their sin! What a cruel fate, theirs! some have told me. I have them before my mind's eye in my essay: "On the Road of Allah."[1] They who suffer for being loyal to what they believe to be right are on Allah's Road. Their number is multiplying in India.

So it is that the struggle of Islam against imperialism is creating new values of freedom in India and the Muslim world. Out of Islamism in the hour of its agony has been born a new Turkish nation; out of it, too, has come a new message to Indian Mussalmans. Who thought that the Turk would become such a force on the side of freedom in Asian politics? A Muslim organ, the *Tevhid-Efkiar*, wrote in a recent issue: "The Turk is too proud to bow his head before the Greek. History, humanity, Islam, honour, independence and liberty are all against it. The Turk knows that to live under

[1] Included in the Volume "My Motherland".

the Greek yoke is a thousand times worse than death, to which we shall never submit, nor can we allow the other races in the Near East who are united to us by moral and economic bounds to submit." A people who could feel this in the very hour of defeat has a claim upon the sympathies of every freedom-loving man. The Treaty of Sevres is a deep denial of Turkish independence and the Khalifa's status; and the earlier the Treaty is torn up the better for the peace of Europe and the East. I have in this volume pleaded, again and again, for Hindu-Muslim unity. In the day that unity becomes, not a political catchword but a real life-experience, we shall have won that *Swaraj* which is not yet in view. In Egypt you will see Christian missionaries in Muslim mosques and the Ulemas of Islam in Christian churches. In Egypt Muslims and Christians, men and women, students and peasants, stand united in the one struggle for independence. In Egypt the solidarity of the people is not merely political; it is vital. Hindu-Muslim unity to be real and abiding must be not a trick of the opportunist, not the strategy of a 'war-period,' but a conviction and consecration of our lives. The

spiritual idealism of the East makes us, Hindus and Muslims, one. The Doctrine of Unity has its special appeal to the Hindu mind; and did not Mahomed preach the doctrine to his people? Did he not also declare: "We make no difference between prophets?" Was not the same truth taught by Sri Krishna? When Krishna and Mahomed join hands together, shall we, the disciples of one or the other, stand apart?

I believe profoundly in the doctrine of *ahimsa*. And I have been asked: how can you with your faith in *ahimsa* sympathise with the sons of Islam? Don't they believe in violence? Many do. But my studies in Islam have taught me that non-violence is the mark of him who is strong. Violence is weakness, as sacrifice is strength. And if men could but glimpse Life—the One Life that flows into all—they would have no room in their hearts for hate and thoughts of strife. In a passage marked by great beauty, Mathew Arnold has rightly said: "Abnegation and mildness based on the depths of inner life and visited by unmerited misfortunes made the power of the first and famous Imams, Ali Hassan and Hussain, over the popular imagination." And Mathew Arnold

illustrates it by a moving incident from Hassan's life—" O brother," said Hassan who was dying of poison, to Hussain who sought to find out and punish the murderer, " O brother, let him alone till he and I meet together before God ". " So his father Ali," Arnold adds, " had stood back from his rights instead of snatching them." So of Hussain himself it was said by his successful rival, the usurping Caliph Yazid— " God loved Hussain and he would not suffer him to attain to any thing ". Is there a nobler achievement than this—to be pure and *not* 'attain any thing'? To '*attain*' by diplomacy and greed and godliness things of the earth—this is the mark and sin of imperialism. In the Indian movement of to-day, Islam is struggling with imperialism; and it is my faith that the movement will be strong in the measure it seeks *not* 'to attain' but to move upon the " Road of Allah ". And that road is not of retaliation or hate or strife, but of patience and self-control and self-sacrifice. It is the road of renunciation. As Jesus said: Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the Earth.

Karachi T. L. VASWANI
October 22, 1921

THE SPIRIT AND STRUGGLE OF ISLAM

THE NEW TEMPLE

Out of the anguish of this hour,
Out of the toil of to-day,
Out of the strivings of these Thy servants,
Out of the prayers and penance of Thy people—
Raise Thou this ancient Race
Rich in the gifts of the Ages but fallen from the heights,
Fair but fettered,
And still struggling to be free.

I see Thy children, Muslims and Hindus, coming together
To Thy new Temple, nobler by far
Than the Mandirs and Mosques of stone;
I see them studying together the Scripture of Love.

This is the Vision I have worshipped
Through the wander-years of my manhood ;
This is the Light I follow on the path of my life ;
This is the Message of my Desert-Land.

The Past is not past ;
Our Heroes and Singers and Sages are not dead ;
They still live in Thee ; they hover over their Native Land ;
And I hear them call us to-day :
"*Unite and be Strong.*"
Akbar the Sindhi and Abul Fazul and the far-famed Shah
Speak through the Veil of Time :
"*Unite and be Strong !*"

The Sages of Vedic Sind, the Sufis of a later age,
The poets and patriots of this Desert where Thou hast walked—
They call us : "Unite and be Strong !"
Our ancient Valley still echoes with the Call ;

The "bulbul" by day and the stars by night
still sing the Union-Song ;
And still the Sindhu flows
Making this music through her sands and
stones :
"Unite and be Strong !"

Lord of the Ages !
We bring red roses of this Faith
As gifts at Thy lotus-feet ;
And our worship to-day is the Dream in our
eyes,
Is the longing that Thou may'st accept us
In the Service of the Nation,
And in the New Temple a-building in Hin-
dusthan
Hold us together—the Hindu and the Mussal-
man !

INDIA AND ISLAM

It was a fashion sometime ago to paint in dark colours the work and ideals of Islam. An English historian gave it as his considered opinion that Muslims made no contribution to the life of India; Islam was regarded as a volcanic force let loose upon the world to uproot and destroy! A critical study of history shows that Islam played no small part in the shaping of civilisation; and Western scholars appreciate the contributions to European life of Spanish Muslims in the days when Europe was plunged in darkness. So we in India are beginning to understand in the light of the new nationalism which is come to reconcile, not antagonise, that if Islam received from India, it also gave to her things of value and beauty. The movement of synthesis in religion, initiated by Guru Nanak, owed not a little to contacts of Hinduism and Islam in this country. The great Teacher himself had a rich

appreciation of the values of Islam, and wished to bring together the Hindu and Musulman in the one service of India. "There is no Hindu and there is no Musulman," he said. "The Book of the Quran," he said to Mian Mitha, "should be practised." Again, speaking to a Kazi he said: "A real Muslim is he who has renounced his self, who has sincerity, patience, purity, who does not harm the living and does not eat the dead. Such a Muslim, indeed, goes to heaven (*bihisht*)." On another occasion he urged that that man was a 'Mulla,' a 'Kazi', who knew the 'Name of God' (*Khuda*). Again: "He is a Kazi who abandons his own self and makes the One Name his support in life." Guru Nanak practised what he preached; he was a great friend of Sheik Farid, a Muslim Pir; the two often travelled together. With deep feeling the Teacher said to the Sheik: "Allah, Allah, Allah only is my object in life"; and several of Sheik Ferid's hymns are incorporated in the Adi Granth. Not without reason did both the Hindu and the Muslim cover Guru Nanak's body with flowers when the Teacher passed away; and, as the old Chronicle says, "the flowers of both remained green"!

In Sind the Sufi movement, which has, with wondrous vitality, survived the shocks of 'modernism,' owes much to the mutual reactions of Vedanta and Islam; the inspiration of the Sindhi Poet—Shah Latif—is at once Hindu and Muhammadan. And the democratic creed and simplicity of Islam communicated to India a new impulse of life. Islam has been a nation-building force in this country; and History salutes Akbar as the third of empire-builders in a line of historical succession to Asoka and Chandra Gupta.

Not the least of Islam's contributions to India have been in the domain of Art. The Arabs and Persians had a culture which assimilated the thought of Egypt and China; and the wonderful Taj (literally the "Crown") at Agra is a witness to the Muslim vision of the Beautiful. Islam introduced an element of energy into Indian art and literature; and it made contributions to architecture. About fifteen new styles of architecture were introduced by Muslims in India and Central Asia. (*Cf.* Fergusson's *History of Indian Architecture.*)

An interesting volume published some time ago by the Government Press of Bombay indicates

the civilisation and architectural attainments of a Muslim kingdom in India in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. The volume is called "Bijapur and its Architectural Remains," and is edited by Mr. Henry Cousens. It is refreshing to read of the Muslim governors of Bijapur and their deep interest in science and arts. Thus Ismail who succeeded his talented father, Yusuf Adil Khan, as the Governor of Bijapur (1510—1539) is described as an "adept in the arts of painting, varnishing, making arrows and embroidering saddle cloths. In music and poetry he excelled most of his age. He was fond of the company of learned men and poets and had a great fund of humour. He was just, prudent, patient, and liberal". Of his grandson, Ibrahim, we read that he was "gentle, good-natured, religious, liberal and delighting in the company of learned men, kind to his servants and a master of architecture". He it was who built the walls of Bijapur and made the city a thing of beauty and strength. Chand Bibi the famous Queen of Bijapur, was endowed with gifts which not many Queens have shown in the world's history. Mr. Henry Cousens compares her to Elizabeth and says she was "her

equal in political talent, education, accomplishments, ruler of a realm as large, and population as numerous, as intelligent and as rich as England". Indeed, in certain respects she was superior to Elizabeth; she was simple, frank, tolerant, as the "good Queen Bess of England" was not.

It was these gifted rulers of the Adil Shahi dynasty—Governors of the Great Moghul—who made Bijapur a city of loveliness and splendour. The Muslim historian of the seventeenth century speaks thus of the great bazar of Bijapur;—"The bazar that lined this great street was filled with shops brimful of every commodity that the East and West could furnish. All the businessman's ingenuity could devise—crystal-goblets, porcelain vases, gold and silver ornaments, rare essences and perfumes, double-distilled spirits, tobacco, finest wines of Portugal—all these were to be found; there, too, you could see the palaces of the nobles and garden-houses of the rich embroidered in greenery; flowers and creepers trailing over the lattice and jalousie, bubbling springs too, and fountains and streams that suggested the Quran's Paradise and the Garden of God."

This was before the Muslim dynasty of Adil Shah fell. Soon after, Bijapur crumbled to its fall; but even then there was that in its ruins which suggested something of the beauty and strength and refinement of its civilisation in the earlier days. Bijapur had a wealth of palaces, cisterns, and minarets expressive of beauty and skill. Its water conduits, its underground tunnels, its stairs and pillared halls, its hanging chains of stone, its wall-paintings, carpet-weaving and pottery, its Gol Gumbaz and tombs and mosques, its stone and wood and ivory gave the city the touch of something strange.

The old builders builded better than do their successors to-day, because they lived in an atmosphere of freedom and found joy in work. The remnants of the old works still reveal something of the technical mastery and spiritual quality of Muslim art and architecture. Their secret was the joy the craftsman took in his work; this work-joy redeemed the life of the great majority, in spite of their simple political conceptions. Will it return to correct the commercialism of to-day? Exiled from big cities—haunts of roaring industry—life's joy in

work may yet find its home in our midst if we revive weaving and *swadeshi* and village crafts and guilds and *panchayats* killed by the immoral policy of economic imperialism. For it is my daily deepening belief that this revival is necessary if the sharp sense of our new national life is to shape a future worthy of the freedom-adventure of this age and of India's ancient heritage.

VITAL VALUES OF ISLAM

The Hindu-Muslim unity! Is it merely a convenient catchword? Or does it interpret a deep emotion of our hearts? Is it only a phrase, an idea? Or does it denote a personal, a social experience? In the midst of much that is depressing in our public life, my thoughts have gone back to the days when the Hindu Raja of Umerkot sheltered the Muslim Humayun, when the Muslim King Akbar built a statue to the memory of the Hindu Rana Pratap Singh, when the Khalifa of Baghdad invited Hindu scholars of Sind to his court, when Hindu kings had Muslim ministers and Muslim generals. And I have seen in villages Muslims and Hindus sit together after the day's work, on a simple carpet, singing together the simple old *kafis* of Sindhi Poets—singing them under the open skies, forgetting for the time being their differences, feeling only their unity as children of a common soil, as worshippers of the One Beauty

and the One Love. When that feeling grows—out of knowledge and sympathy—Hindus and Muslims will be friends for ever. And if I seek here to interpret the values of Islam, it is with a view to indicating the higher basis of that Hindu-Muslim unity which is the promise of a better India and the hope of a mighty Indian nation in the coming days.

My appreciation of Hindu-Muslim unity is not that of political opportunism; it grows out of recognition of the vital values of the faith, the culture, the civilisation of the Muslims. I salute Mohamad as one of the world's mighty heroes. Mohamad has been a world-force, a mighty power for the uplift of many peoples. Read the old records, and you will glimpse the grace and beauty of his life. A king and a spiritual leader, he yet mends his clothes, visits the sick, loves little children in the streets, lives on simple food—sometimes taking only dates and water—milks his cattle, accepts invitations of slaves, mixes with the people as their comrade. 'I sit at meals as a servant,' he says, 'for I am really a servant.' 'Show us the way that is established—the way of those on whom is peace'—this his constant

prayer. For this word Islam means peace. He hearkens to the call of the unseen: "O thou enwrapped in thy mantle! Arise and preach!" They persecute him; his very life is in danger; but he is loyal to the 'Call'; he moves about preaching the Way of Peace. Again and again, he has the 'fits'; the pressure of the Unseen is upon him; and his trembling lips utter the eloquent wisdom recorded in the Koran. Yet one European critic—Sprenger—speaks of Mohamad's 'fits' as 'epilepsy'! Carlyle has better understanding of Mohamad when he speaks of him as the type of the heroic Prophet. Mohamad was a hero and a prophet; and I have often meditated on the last words whispered by him before he passed away: "Lord! grant me pardon, and join me to the fellowship on high—yes, the Blessed Fellowship on high!" Who will not say that such a man was beautiful in life, beautiful in death?

And consider for a moment what the faith he preached has achieved. Islam has given the world a religion without priests; Islam abolished infanticide in Arabia; Islam enjoined on the faithful total abstinence from drink; Islam emphasised the great qualities

of faith, courage, endurance and self-sacrifice; Islam introduced a vigorous puritanism into Asia and Europe, deprecating even dancing and card-playing. 'Who so is a Muslim,' says the Koran, 'he seeketh after the right way.' Islam moved out with its great message of 'Allah the Rahman, the Merciful,' and became the torch-bearer of culture and civilisation in Africa, in China, in Central Asia, in Europe, in Persia, in India. The Chinese Muslims are still known to be stately, strong and brave. Of the achievements of Islam in the days of the Baghdad Khilafat every Muslim may well be proud; and every Sindhi too;—for Sindhis had their share in the intellectual life of the Baghdad court. Of the achievements of Islam in Europe, less is known to the Muslims and Hindus in Sind; yet even a rapid sketch will show how much Islam did for Europe in the Middle Ages. Islam founded the great University of Cordova which attracted Christian scholars from different parts of Europe. One of these scholars became, in due course, the Pope of Rome.

At a time when Europe was in darkness, the Muslim scholars of Spain held high the torch of

science and literature. They taught medicine and mathematics, chemistry and natural history, philosophy and fine arts.

Arabian scholars translated some of the Hindu books; and helped by these translations Hindu wisdom travelled to some of the seats of learning in Europe. In the days of the Muslim king of Spain, Al Hakeem, great irrigation systems were developed in Granada, Valencia and Aragon; the Muslims also built hospitals, and asylums for the poor in several cities in Spain. Many were the industries developed under Islam. Shipbuilding, horticulture, candied fruits, glass, iron and copper utensils, brocade, tanyards, silver mines, cotton manufactures, woollen carpets, hand-woven woollen cloth, linen manufactures, and linen paper, mines of lapis-lazuli, silks and inlaid metal work are some of the industries of Muslim Spain mentioned by Arabic writers.

And it is no exaggeration to say that Islam has made several contributions to the thought and life of India. Islam has been one of the nationalising forces in India. Islam has enriched the art and architecture, the poetry and philosophy of India. The Taj is, perhaps, the most

imaginative architecture in the world. Islam carried in its heart a vision of manhood and democracy to which, however, the Muslims were not always loyal in India and other countries; but it must be remembered that the first blow at slavery was struck when Omar set all slaves at liberty after his conquest of Jerusalem. And the ideal of Akbar, the ideal of an Indian nation, a Great India, a Maha Bharata has not yet been assimilated by India's English rulers. The reform movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth century—the movements of Nanak, Kabir and Dadu—felt the influence of Islam; and Muslim saints like the Pir Tabriz of Multan and Lal Shabaz of Sewan have still a hold on Hindu hearts. Muslim poetry and literature, Muslim architecture and decorative painting made Spain famous at a time when Europe was submerged in barbarism. The Muslim Universities of Sevile, Cordova and Barcelona taught sciences and philosophy in that free liberal spirit for lack of which the Christian Church burnt Bruno and persecuted Galileo; Muslim kings opened free libraries, established observatories and endowed laboratories for chemical experiments; Muslim

singers introduced a new note of chivalry and romance into the life and literature of Europe; and Muslim philosophers translated, interpreted and corrected the systems and speculations of Greek thinkers.

Two of these philosophers who greatly influenced European thought are known as Avicenna and Averroes. 'Avicenna' is a Latin corruption of Arabic Ibn Sinna. This man showed the greatness of his soul when he renounced the honoured post of the Vazir in order to devote his time to philosophy; and his name is celebrated in several Turkish tales. He wrote on logic, on psychology, on physics and metaphysics and ethics. He speaks of three kinds of mind—vegetative, animal and human; his view of the 'vegetative mind' reminds one of modern studies in what Sir J. C. Bose has called the 'response of plants.' He speaks of 'active' and 'speculative' intelligence, reminding one of what, over eight centuries later, Kant called 'practical' and 'pure' reason. He speaks of 'three kinds of evil' and its 'accidental' place in the universe, reminding one of the *theodicy* of Leibnitz. Another Muslim philosopher who influenced

the thought of the Middle Ages was Averroes—a corruption of the Arabic name Ibn Rushid. He speaks of the 'evolution' of matter in a way which reminds us of the idea developed in Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy; he speaks of a *soul* diffused in the heavens and the earth—an idea which reminds us of what to-day is called *pan-psychism*; he interprets 'soul' in terms of 'energy'; he recognises the unity of philosophy and religion. His commentaries on Aristotle and Plato have been translated into some of the European languages, and at one time influenced Christian and Jewish thought and some of the non-Muslim centres of European culture.

The Sufi singers and thinkers of Islam have enriched poetry and the philosophy of religion. One of the world's greatest mystical thinkers was the Muslim Muhyi-al-din-ibn-al-Arabi; and in the whole range of literature there are not many mystical books so profound, so suggestive as the four volumes of his Futuhat-al-Makkuja. His teachings of the Single One, of Seven Realities, of the 'luminous darkness' that enshrouds the essence of God, of *surah* and *ruh* (form and spirit), of knowledge as a process of reminiscence, of the correlation of the

Creator and creature (*al-Haqq* and *Khalq*), of the seven degrees of annihilation (*fana*), of man as a channel of God's self-realisation, of God as the Self of things—these and other teachings of this Muslim mystic have a profound value for the modern student of religion. The Quran was given to a simple people, but has, in some of its texts, the seed of true mysticism. "Wheresoever ye turn, there is the face of Allah." What wisdom in this one text of the Koran! And some of the great Muslim poets—our own Shah Latif included—sound, again and again, the purest notes of mysticism. 'Knowledge is nearer to silence than to speech.' 'I fancied that I loved him, but on consideration I saw that his Love preceded mine.' "Thou must daily die a thousand deaths and come to life again that thou mayst win the life immortal." 'When thou givest to God thy nothingness, He gives to thee his All.' "See in your own heart the knowledge of the Prophet, without book, without tutor, without preceptor." 'The true mosque in a pure and holy heart is builded; there let all men worship God; for there He dwells, not in a mosque of stone.' 'He peeped through the window of my

heart—He peeped and passed away.' These are but a few passages taken from the songs and sayings of Muslim mystics. Who will say that the higher mind of the Muslim world is alien to that which has expressed itself in the sages and seers of Aryavarta? The higher mind—with its intuitions of truth, freedom, justice, beauty, love—is not the monopoly of one faith or one race; it is a descent on the earth from the Kingdom of Heaven; and, in the measure in which a civilisation is loyal to it, is it vital and progressive. And if the present moment be, indeed, one of awakening in India, we will discover the Hindu-Muslim unity not in counsels of expediency, not in the political opportunism which only reacts on a nation's life making it feeble, but in the higher mind which is the one common source of the fundamental ideas of Oriental and Occidental civilisations. *There* is the inner unity of Hindus and Muslims; there they have a common centre; the bond between them is *spiritual*. At an hour when the world's atmosphere is charged with pride and passion, with political and race-hatreds, I plead for a Hindu-Muslim union in the great name of Humanity. India has, through

the ages, borne witness to Her—borne witness to the Vision of man as man. And if, worshipping this Vision in our hearts, we make the Hindu-Muslim unity an abiding force in our public life, we shall, indeed, make our backward India beautiful, and our eyes shall behold Her glory.

ISLAM AND IMPERIALISM

The true spirit of religion is that of devotion to the common good. Muslims and Hindus should be common worshippers, to-day, in a temple more stately than any *mandir* or *masjid*. —the new Temple of Indian Nationality. None should enter a temple with any thought of ill-will, any hate in his heart. Islam means, literally, Peace; and the true Mussalman is he who strives to be at peace with man and God. We must come into the new temple, also, as servants of Truth, of *Satya*. Than Truth there is no higher *dharma*—such is the teaching of the Hindu scriptures; and my Muslim friends will remember what the very first Khalifa of Islam taught. It is treason, he said, to conceal truth from the rulers. Faithless, indeed, are they who, to gain their private ends, flatter officials; loyal to the nation are they who speak the truth and suffer for the truth, knowing that all suffering is passing, that Truth alone conquers.

What do we want? What do the Muslims demand? What is this Khilafat matter about? The Muslim demand is so reasonable, so just, that my wonder is how Europe can afford to trample upon it. The demand is twofold. First, that the Muslim holy places should be under the control of the Calipha. These are Mecca, Medina and other places in the 'Isle of Arabia'. The Muslim motive is not commercial; Islam does not, like modern Europe, worship Mammon as its God; the 'Isle of Arabia' is a poor place; but it has something more precious to the Muslim than silver and gold; it enshrines the dust of the Prophets of old; the 'Isle of Arabia' is, to the Muslim, holy; it is to him an Isle of God. Can a Calipha be a real Calipha who has no status in the 'Isle of Arabia'? 'But what can we do?' says the Supreme Council; 'Arabia wants freedom; and must it not have it on the principle of *self-determination*?' Strange argument this from a nation that has not yet applied the principle of self-determination to India and Ireland and Egypt! We in India have learnt, by bitter experience, to cherish freedom as the highest, holiest thing; and

Indians will rejoice in the thought of Arabia's freedom; but his freedom can be easily reconciled with the Khilafat claims, if, indeed, Europe really desires not to disturb the integrity of Islam's world-brotherhood; let Arabia have autonomy within the Turkish Empire. Surely, Islam stands to lose by Arabia's 'independence' 'under British protection,' but has everything to gain by Arabia's 'independence' under the Calipha of Islam.

The second Muslim demand is a corollary of the first. If the Calipha is to be a real Calipha, if he is to defend the holy places of Islam, he should have a navy, army and economic resources such as may really secure him the status of a strong Muslim power. Hence the necessity of his retaining his dominions in Europe and Asia Minor. Unfortunately, Europe has been busy, for over forty years, with its plans of partitioning Turkey. It was in 1878 that the Treaty of Berlin was signed. That Treaty has been rightly criticised by the great-souled Englishman, Morley, as 'an extensive partition of the Turkish Empire,' as 'the virtual ratification of the policy of bag and baggage'. Students of history know, also, of the 'Cyprus Convention,'

the secret agreement by which England snatched Cyprus from the Turk under the convenient excuse of managing 'reforms' in Asiatic Turkey! Why is England anxious to undertake the task of 'reforming' other countries? Such 'altruism' only shocks the world-conscience when it ends in exploitation! France snatched Morocco from Turkey, Italy took Tripoli, and England, once again, with professions of 'reforms,' occupied Egypt! The motive was imperialistic, the excuse altruisic! To-day, the Powers of Europe want to partition Turkey still further; and altruistic professions are again in evidence. France wants Smyrna; it has rich mines and oil fields! England wants Mesopotamia! Mr. Churchill says the English hold on it must not be relaxed; it is rich in industrial possibilities, and will help in paying off the Empire's war-debts! England seeks to pursue a policy of 'peaceful penetration' in the East. As to France and Italy, an English paper confessed, the other day, that 'French and Italian claims to Adalia and Cilicia are purely imperialistic'. Must Turkey be sacrificed on the altar of the capitalist imperialistic ambitions of European powers? India lifts up her

voice against this plan of Europe; and India says she has a right to make her voice heard. India is a member of the League of Nations; Indian Mussalmans did much to inflict defeat on Turkey in the War; India is given 'reforms' which cannot work in an atmosphere of unrest such as must continue if the Khilafat matter is not settled in accord with Muslim claims; and who knows what may be the developments of Muslim unrest in the East? God forbid! But should the day come when Egypt and Afghanistan and Persia and Asiatic Turkey succumb to the allurements of advancing Bolshevism—should the day come—India, that only last year paid for military expenditure 85 crores out of a total revenue of 135½ crores—India will be called upon again to pay heavily for war in the East; and it is India's clear duty at this hour to lift up her voice and say to the government: "For the sake of India and the East, for the sake of world-peace, do not have a wrong solution of the Khilafat problem."

Indians have resolved that until the Khilafat matter is settled in accord with just Muslim claims, it will be their duty to practise 'Non-co-operation'. Non-co-operation, let me

remind you, does not mean violence or bloodshed. Perish this tongue if it ever preach counsels of violence or passion or hate. Not to co-operate with the administration means imposing sufferings on ourselves, not doing violence to others. To throw up titles and seats in the Councils, and to give up government jobs would mean suffering for us. I hope in this experiment we shall proceed by stages, making sure of the first step before advancing to another. But every step, I am sure, would mean *suffering* for us, not violence to others, not hate or ill-will to any one. Not an easy path this to tread; it means hardship; it means the provoking of official wrath; it means self-sacrifice. Are we ready for it? ready in heart and mind and will? ready to suffer and sacrifice? One thing I know: no people can hope to be strong without sacrifice. The Hindu books tell us, again and again, that this world, so full of beauty and life, has sprung from the heart of sacrifice; and there is a similar teaching, also, in Muslim scriptures; it is called *kurbani*: 'We have appointed,' says the Koran, 'to every nation a sacrifice.' What is the sacrifice, the *kurbani*, the *mansak*, appointed to the Indian nation at this hour? I am

grateful to my Muslim friends for their resolve to abstain from cow-slaughter. Unto us of the Indian nation has been appointed another sacrifice to-day;—not the *kurbani* of the cow, but the sacrifice of personal ease and honours, of comfort and titles and money and possessions. In sacrifice is the seed of a mighty future for the Indian people. The followers of Islam are asked in their books to offer a sacrifice on the birth of a child. A new Child has been born to India at this hour; that Child is the Hindu-Muslim unity. Nourish the Child with sacrifice; and the newborn babe will wax in wisdom and strength, will grow into a spiritual athlete, and with a power mightier than the power of Rustum and Sohrab, will fight with spiritual weapons India's battles of freedom in the coming days.

There is a beautiful text in the Koran which in imperfect English may be translated thus: 'We shall throw you into the fire of the spirit and you will emerge refined.' It seems to be the will of God to throw us, to-day, into the fire of the spirit'. As many as will pass through this fire will 'emerge refined'; they will be purified by self-renunciation; in them

will shine the beauty of the Indian ideal; in them will the Mother be magnified; and through their *tapasya* and suffering and love, Islam may yet win her moral victory over Western diplomacy, and her flag may yet float high, bearing witness to the One Allah and the immaterial values of life against the greed and exploitation and baptised barbarism of the nations of the West.

THE GENIUS OF ISLAM

Europe has failed to do justice to the Turk; it finds it difficult to rise above the interests of capitalistic imperialism; it continues to have dense prejudices against El Islam. The Turk is known for courtesy, for bravery, for kindness to animals; the Turkish women are patriotic and some of the speeches of Hanum, the famous woman-leader of the Turkish Nationalist movement are kindled with the fire of intense patriotism. Europe has not viewed the Turkish problem in a spirit of sympathy; Europe does not appreciate, does not understand the faith and culture of Islam. Not many of the non-Muslims in India do so either. Yet if the re-established Hindu-Muslim unity is to be an abiding force in our life, it is necessary for the Hindu and the Muslim to be in sympathy each with the other's culture and faith. My sympathy with my Muslim brethren is deepened when I think of the noble teachings of Islam and the historic part it has played in

the life of humanity; and I would have Young India grow in the new spirit of sympathy and appreciation of the great values of Islamic faith and culture.

The notion that Islam is intolerant has grown partly out of interested motives, partly out of ignorance. The very word Islam means 'peace'; and the Koran abounds with passages breathing a beautiful spirit of peace, good-will and love. Every *surah* of the Koran begins with the significant words: 'In the name of God, Compassionate, Merciful.' In a beautiful passage in the Muslim scriptures, we read: "The people of the Books, such as Christians, Jews, Muslims, and those who believe in the unity and singleness of God, and the immortality of the soul, and practise charity and are benevolent and kind to the poor and take care of the orphans—they are the People of Salvation." And in another passage we have the following remarkable injunction: "*Let there be no compulsion in religion.*" The Prophet had a catholic vision; Abraham, he said, was a Muslim; and one of the sayings attributed to him indicates his view of a true believer in Islam. "A perfect Muslim," he said, "is he

from whose tongue and hands mankind is safe." The Rule of Life for the true Mussalman, the Prophet expressed in the following words reminiscent of the teachings of Jesus: "Do unto others what you would have them do to you; and reject for others what you would reject for yourself." It is no surprise that the Jews have been better treated by Muslims than by Christians and have preferred to stay in Muslim rather than in Christian lands. One day a bier passed by the Prophet; being told it was the bier of a Jew, he said: "Was it not the holder of a soul from which we should take example and fear?" Yes—the Jew has a soul as much as any other child of God; how often has not Christian Europe forgotten this? And Islam was tolerant not simply to the Jew but also to the Christian. The Christian Church in Muslim Spain was given large lands and considerable revenues; Christian envoys were received with courtesy and allowed to take away relics of Christian saints and martyrs from the Muslim territory; Gibbon says in his *Decline and Fall* that Muslim rulers even transcribed 'an Arabic version of the Canons of the Councils of Spain for the

use of the Bishops and Clergy in the Moorish Kingdom'. Haroon-Al-Rashid, the hero of the "Arabian Nights," planted in his kingdom a large number of schools; the head of these schools, his Director of Education, was a Christian named John. Islam when in power has been tolerant to Christians and Jews; and the much-maligned Turk has not been a stranger to the tolerant spirit of Islam. During the War, the Bulgarians attacked Turkey; they reached Chatalja and it was feared they might take the city at any moment; just then died a prelate of the Greek Church in Constantinople; and the Turks even in those anxious days made ready to give the prelate an imposing public funeral. Yet Europe accuses the Muslim of intolerance! It was a Muslim who said there was no quarrel between Muhammadans and Christians, "for God will gather us both in, and unto Him we shall return". The Muslim added: "A Christian who loves Muslims and respects their faith must be counted as a Muslim by all true believers everywhere. He is on the way with us, bound on the same journey; and to hold aloof from him or flout him would be sin." Could toleration further

go? And the culture of Islam! A whole volume could be written on the subject. Europe is indebted to Muslims more than she cares to remember to-day. In the Middle Ages when Europe was in darkness, it was the scholars and thinkers and scientists of Islam who held high the torch of culture. They translated Greek and Roman classics and so became heralds of the renaissance movement in Europe; they taught sciences, medicine, history, art, poetry, philosophy, religion. Jabir was a great chemist; he discovered sulphuric acid, nitric acid, and acqua regia. Ibn Musa wrote on spherical trigonometry; Alberuni was a botanist, and, indeed, stayed in India for forty years to collect materials for his studies in science. The words alembic, alkali, etc., derived as they are from Muslim language, indicate how much the Muslims had made chemistry their favourite study. Some Muslim scientists established observatories; and a French writer points out that Kepler owed not a little to Nur-ud-Din, the author of a book on the 'Sphere'. Muslim kings established free libraries and colleges and schools of learning; Haroon-al-Rashid attached a school to every

mosque he built; Cairo had a school of Science and a Free Library on a grand scale. Cordova, Seville and Granada had famous Universities. In architecture, as in science, Muslims made themselves famous. There are several theories of the origin of Muslim architecture; there is the Egyptian theory which attributes much to the Copts; there is the Indian theory which emphasises the influence of Indian craftsmen on the mosques; there is the Roman theory developed by Rivoria in a recent book which looks to the imperial city as the centre of those influences which shaped the Muslim style. One thing is clear; Muslim architecture has enriched Europe and Egypt and India with some of the noblest buildings; Muslim architecture has made a positive contribution to the spiritual and æsthetic stock of the human race.

Islamic civilisation, too, has subordinated money to the immaterial values of life; it has not, like Europe, worshipped mammon as its God; it has not shared Europe's commercial faith; it has not, like the Christian nations, clamoured for coal and oil and the economic exploitation of Eastern countries. "The love

of the world," said the Prophet, "is the root of all evil." What a sad commentary these words on the civilisation of modern Europe! Capitalism, imperialism, commercialism, land-grabbing, exploitation—the root of it all is 'love of the world'. Europe has yet to know what it is to place love of *man* above love of the *world*; and there can be no democracy without love of man as man. This democracy is the very essence of Islam. *Alla ho Akbar*! God alone is Great! What a faith, what an inspiration—this ringing cry! How often did not Mohamad declare that he, too, was a man, a man like others, a mortal, a servant of Allah the Merciful? All are equal in the sight of Allah; all need His mercy;—such is the Muslim's conviction; and Islamic architecture and poetry and philosophy and civilisation express this truth in a variety of ways. This faith makes Islam a Brotherhood, an International Brotherhood, a Fellowship of many races and tribes.

This faith is not dead even in these days of Muslim decline and decadence; this faith the Muslim cherishes in his heart at this dark hour in his history; this faith is the promise of his future. This faith in democracy under God

is yet the inspiration of the ancient Muslim University at Cairo. This faith breaks out in a recent Egyptian novel which gives a beautiful picture of Islam. This faith is at the heart of the writings of Hanoum and Izat Halide Melyh Dey, the new novelist of Turkey, the author of 'Conflicts,' 'Leila' and 'Sermed'. The last book especially gives one an idea of the spirit of freedom among Turkish women, and is a powerful protest against the prejudice that the Turk treats his wife as a submissive slave. This novel is, also, an eloquent interpretation of the ideal of monogamy, and shows how a Mussalman, if only he is loya to the spirit of Islam, can move in a beautiful ethical atmosphere even when his environment is embarassing.

There is a story of men who travelled long distances in order that they might listen to the Voice of God. They reached a sanctuary. They sat on its steps; they wanted to hear the Voice. Some one passing by asked why they were there. They said, "We have waited; but the Voice has not yet spoken." Alas! They were sitting on the steps outside; they had no fellowship with other people; they did

not know that the gates of the sanctuary would be flung open only when all would enter together the shrine within, where the Voice was speaking. Friends! We, too, have travelled long distances; and we are sitting on the outer steps. The great God of the nations summons us to have fellowship one with the other; there is so much in the faiths and cultures of the Hindu and the Muslim which both can appreciate and be proud of; did not Mohamad say: "We make no differences among Prophets?" One thing I am convinced of;—in the Hindu-Muslim fellowship is a mighty hope of our future. Therefore I ask you all to get together in knowledge, in sympathy, in friendship; therefore I ask you to enter together the new Shrine of the Nation. The Voice of God is speaking there, and has a message for a united people.

THE WAY OF SACRIFICE

(A *BAKR-ID* MESSAGE TO SIND MUSLIMS)

To you, my Muslim friends, each year's Id has been a day of feast and joy. So it will not be this Id Day. The Call to Prayer, as you may know, was in the Prophet's days sung by Belial; but when the prophet passed away, Belial resolved never to sing the Call again; his rich strong voice was heard only once after his Master's departure and that was when Omer went to Damascus; him the people urged to ask Belial to sing the Call; he was an old man, this Belial at this time; and in obedience to Omer's word, he sang and the people of Damascus came in large numbers to hear him; the memory of his master and the deep sorrow in his heart made his words most moving; and when he sang "Allah-O-Akbar" all about him wept aloud and tears streamed down even the warrior-faces in the crowd. You too, this

Id Day, have a memory of your Master and the great days of Islam; you too have deep sorrow in your hearts; for the diplomacy of Europe has crippled the power of your Khalifa, has trampled upon your sentiments in regard to the Holy Places precious to you as enshrining the dust of saints and patriarchs and the Prophet; and in your morning prayer you may well weep aloud as you hear the ancient words: "Allah-O-Akbar."

The injustice done to Islam and to Europe is so appalling that the very stars beholding it must burn with anger. But I would have you raise your hearts above sorrow and anger; I would have you think this day of sacrifice. It is significant that the central festival of Islam is the day of sacrifice. On the Id Day, as you may remember, the Prophet uttered the significant words: "I sacrifice for the people—for all those who bear witness to thy unity and to my mission." To observe the day, thus, you must, as your own scripture tells you, have a triple fellowship—fellowship with your relatives, fellowship with the family of the nation—the family includes Hindus and Parsis and Christians,

fellowship with the poor, no matter what their race or religion.

Islam abolished slavery centuries before England attempted the task; and Abu Bekkar spent the greater portion of his fortune of forty thousand *dirhems* in setting the Arab slaves free—women and men. Your Prophet preached equality, and it is for you to bear witness to his message of the Kingdom of Brotherhood.

If you would press through the present darkness to the light, you must practise the method of sacrifice. That is the word I send you, this Id Day. The way to challenge the wrong done you by Europe's organised imperialism is not violence of word or act: the strength of self-control and self-renouncement must tell in the long run; no imperialism can long stand against the moral forces in the heart of man; and the steam-roller of capitalist imperialism can no more crumble to dust the power of Islam than the sun can rise in the West. The mighty Spirit of Asia is with you in the struggle.

PEACEFUL PENETRATION!

The Muslims are in profound sorrow; their money, their valour, their blood achieved victory for England in the East; their appeals to England have, so far, proved fruitless; Mr. Lloyd George has failed them, as Great Britain has failed Asia. The settlement of the Turkish question will not make for world-peace; behind it is the old diplomacy, not honest statesmanship. Islam is not dead; Islam has its own contributions to make to modern life; and Islam must not be denied opportunities of political expression. The Allies could have helped Turkey to be reconstituted on a modern basis; but Europe has long desired not the reconstruction but dismemberment of the empire of El Islam. "The Turks," said the most eminent Liberal minister of Europe, "should carry away their abuses in the only possible manner, namely, by carrying off themselves". And during the War the feeling throughout Europe

was that if the Allies were successful, the Turk must go! Indeed, England had a secret treaty with Russia in regard to Constantinople; but the Russian Revolution upset England's plans. At the Peace Conference Mr. Lloyd George offered Constantinople, again and again, to America! The decision to leave the Khalifa-Sultan in Constantinople is only a matter of cold diplomacy. France fears British ascendancy in Constantinople; President Wilson refused to accept the English premier's offer: and England cannot afford to offend France. Hence the happy family arrangement arrived at when the Allied forces occupied Constantinople. The British occupied Pera, the French Stambol, the Italians Scutari; the three principal parts of the city have thus then distributed among the three Allies, and Constantinople is under a triple Allied control to-day! Yet the proclamation issued by the Allies says—'The entente powers have no intention to destroy the Sultan's authority'! and that they 'persist in their purpose not to deprive the Turks of Constantinople'! 'But if, God forbid,' significantly adds the proclamation, 'troubles develop and massacres occur, that decision probably

will be modified'! Such a proclamation can only insult the moral sense of Islam; its words are smooth; its purpose is a political *coup* for the benefit of the 'Big Three'. The occupation of Constantinople, we are told, 'is provisional'. One is reminded of the British occupation of Egypt; 'provisional' becomes easily synonymous with 'indefinite' in Britain's dictionary of diplomacy! It was a French paper which wrote recently: "Everybody knows that when British troops settle anywhere they settle for ever; and Constantinople is certainly an alluring key . . . Thus Britain is about to grab a position as mistress of the world . . . British diplomacy is greater than the diplomacy of all other nations because it is the most cynical."

Diplomacy, again, not justice to the sentiments of Islam and the claims of the Orient, shaped the decision of the San Remo Conference with regard to Turkey-in-Asia. Greece got Smyrna: Italy was given Albania; France acquired a 'mandate' in Syria; Great Britain was given mandates for Mesopotamia, including Mosul and Palestine. The Premier's 'pledge' of January 5,1918, has been often quoted; it said the Allies did not fight 'to deprive Turkey of

Thrace and the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor which are predominantly Turkish in race'! That 'pledge' served its purpose then! It induced the Muslim to put forth renewed efforts for the Allied cause in the War; to-day the Allies stand as victors in the War; and the pledge has become a "scrap of paper"! Diplomacy has long ceased to be an honest craft in the councils of Europe.

The purpose underlying the unrighteous Turkish settlement is imperialism and economic exploitation, all smooth talk of 'self-determination' notwithstanding! The city of Smyrna in the district of Smyrna is the biggest city in Asia Minor, and an important centre of commerce; three railways converge at Smyrna; and to deprive Turkey of Smyrna is to paralyse its economic life. Syria has abundance of petroleum and asphalt; Palestine is rich in minerals; and both France and Britain were determined to make their 'rights' respected in the East! Capitalistic imperialism has long dreamt of 'peaceful penetration' in Eastern lands! The War shattered the German dream; the victory has revived British and French dreams of exploitation in the Orient.

Mesopotamia was, so far, only a scriptural 'blessed word'; to-day, it is a 'blessed field' for British exploitation! It is about one-twelfth the size of India. It is true its population is less than that of Sind; but it has—the Premier said it in the Commons—'some of the richest natural resources of any country in the world'; and European capital is ready to flow into the land, while India is near enough to supply cheap labour! Thus may be fulfilled the purpose of 'civilisation' in the East! A British syndicate has already been formed to secure the commercial prizes which Mesopotamia promises to the brave 'pioneers' of civilisation! Mr. Lloyd George referred with some joy to 'the rich promise of the oil-supply of Mosul'; and the deputation sent by the British Cotton-growing Association reported on the 'very considerable possibilities of Mesopotamia for cotton-growing'. 'Mesopotamia,' we are told, 'is the home of perennial irrigation.' There is ample room, too, for the growth of the brick and pottery trade. All this promises a good market for the manufactures, agricultural implements and machinery of Great Britain. There is much talk to-day of Britain's 'rights'

and 'responsibility', of the British Government's 'duty' to 'act the part of a wise and farseeing guardian who makes provision for the training of his charge with a view to fitting him to take his place in the world of men'! It is convenient to talk philanthropy; in practical life a nation cannot do its 'duty' to another if the face of its statesmanship be turned to greed and gold, not to the Sermon on the Mount; and governments will wander from hypocrisy to hypocrisy until they learn to listen to the Teacher of the Way, the Truth and the Life. As it is, the unrighteous settlement of the Turkish question only enables Great Britain to establish her 'red strip' from the Mediterranean through Arabia and Mesopotamia to Persia which is near Afghanistan! And the Indian Empire which adjoins the Afghan land is already a rich field of exploitation for the British capitalist!

It is easy to see in this settlement *selfish* determination, but where is '*self*-determination'? If a plebiscite were taken, we know what the result would be; no Muslim country would consent to be under European control. Islam cannot be at rest when its Kalipha has no status in the Holy Cities and the Muslim

world; Syria and Mesopotamia cannot appreciate the 'mandatory' powers of France and Britain; the National Conference of Syrians have already drawn up their Declaration of Independence in Damascus, making military service compulsory; the Declaration has been signed by Christians and Jews no less than by the Muslims; and in an open letter published in *The Journal de Beyrouth*, the Syrians say they are for 'an independent nation free and united,' not for 'a protectorate, a mandate or collaboration'; they urge that a new Syria 'can only be set up upon the shoulders of a free and united nation'. In his diplomatic speech in the Commons, Mr. Lloyd George spoke patronisingly of Emir Feisul; did he forget the 'extremely severe' reply of Lord Curzon to the Emir's letter which asked the Allies to respect the wishes of the Syrian Congress, declaring Syria to be a free nation? "The decision of the Syrian Congress," said the Emir's special delegate to the Allies, "was in perfect agreement with the oft-repeated promises of Great Britain and France, and must be looked upon as an appeal to the loyalty of the Allies to hasten the putting of the promises in force."

The Syrians will know now the difference between promises and performance! The 'Big Powers' have brushed aside the opinions and 'sentiments' of 'those Orientals' as deserving scant consideration. The result can only be profound unrest. Speaking of the Turkish problem, Signor Nitti said: "We cannot be indifferent regarding the raw materials which are to be found in large quantities in Asia Minor." And the French Chamber greeted his words with applause! So Mr. Lloyd George's statements in the Commons indicate that Great Britain covets Mesopotamia for its untapped reservoirs of oil! Persia has already passed within England's 'sphere of influence'. The Anglo-Persian Treaty gives England the power to direct the financial and military destiny of Persia; the treaty establishes in substance an English 'protectorate' over Persia! The oil fields of Persia have proved too tempting for Great Britain!

But you cannot make a new world by grabbing; you cannot help civilisation by partitioning Asia into zones of financial penetration. In arriving at the Turkish settlement the Powers of Europe have thought '*imperially*' when they should have thought *humanly*, have viewed the

problem from the point of view of Europe's commercialism and strategic system when they should have recognised the Eastern standpoint and the right relations of West to East in the movement of civilisation. The impulse behind the Turkish settlement is that of economic imperialism, not that of a League of Nations drawn together in the service of humanity.

The 'Big Three' practically said at the Conference: "The Turkish Empire is at our mercy; let us keep its harbours, railways and oil-wells for ourselves!" It is one of the most shameful settlements of Europe; it is a breach of the Premier's faith with Muslim India and Islam: at its heart is the sin of imperialism; it is an assault on the Spirit of Asia. What that spirit is saying, who can understand to-day? But I, who believe that the best men and women of East and West are meant to be comrades for the building of a brotherly civilisation, I who believe that above states and nations stands the Most High working His will in diverse ways, I fain would ask my Muslim friends, at this hour, to say nothing, to do nothing which may even seem to lack self-control. The spirit that bears much, suffers much, is essential to

success; it is the spirit that has sustained heroes in their struggles for the right. A just cause, indeed, may ail or be wounded; it cannot die. And I fain would have all friends of the Khilafat movement to keep in their hearts the simple, spiritual message of the Muslim Scripture: "Ye that believe! seek help and strength through patience and prayer; Verily, Allah is with the patient."

ললিত মোহন লাইব্রেরী
স্থাপিত ১৯৩৯
নদীয়া - সম্মিলনী

THE AGONY OF ISLAM

[In this Paper, only a few aspects of the Premier's 'Reply' to the Khilafat Deputation are discussed.]

The Prime Minister's reply to the Khilafat Deputation is a diplomatic document; it rests on a partial view of the problem; and if it interprets the settled mind of the Supreme Council, it is a severe sentence passed on the faith and empire of El Islam. It regards the Khilafat question, at best, from the point of view of Europe; but is Europe synonymous with the world? Is all the Orient a cypher? The Premier's reply is weak just where continental papers would regard it as strong;—it voices the prejudices of secular, 'Christian' Europe against the Muslim Turk. 'Enlightened' Europe has its prejudices, and few so strong as those it has against the sons of Islam whose loyalty to Prophet Mohamad only enriches their reverence for other prophets;

there are Muslim lands where Jesus is revered as 'Rooh-Allah,' the 'Spirit of God'.

What do the Khilafat deputation want? What do the millions of Muslims, and their non-Muslim sympathisers in India and other parts of the world, want? Only this; that the Empire which is not 'Christian' even in a conventional sense, the majority of its citizens being non-Christians, should look at the Khilafat question from a broad, human standpoint, and respond to the noblest sentiments of its Muslim members. Consider, briefly, what the Premier's reply amounts to. The Sultan is to stay in Constantinople with foreign guns; Thrace, rich in material resources, is to pass out of the Sultan's into Greek hands; Arabia is to be independent of Turkey; Syria is to be given to the French and Mesopotamia to Great Britain; Armenians, scattered in different parts, are to be independent of Turkey. Is it honest to carry the process of partition so far that Turkey is all but 'finished?' Is it wise to wound the profound religious sentiments of the Muslims who regard Turkey as a symbol of Islamic power and the Sultan-Caliph as a chosen Protector of their Holy Places? Is it

statesmanlike to forget that the Muslim unrest throughout Asia, the Hindu-Muslim unrest in India, may have consequences the world may deplore, may throw millions of Asiatics into the eager hands of the Bolsheviks? They err who think the Khilafat question is a struggle between the 'mediæval' and the modern. The Muslim of to-day clings passionately to Islam not simply as to a creed but as to a civilisation, a culture which I wish to see become a world-influence for the healing of 'modern' life. The Khilafat question is fast becoming a matter between the Orient and the Occident; what touches Islam touches India and the East.

'No Muhammadan in India,' says the Premier, 'should imagine that we entered this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam.' We easily understand that the *motives* of this war were not 'mediæval'; but who will deny that the mediæval, crusading motive has definitely entered into the attitude toward Turkey developed by the British public since the armistice? Else why this practical unanimity of opinion in England that the Turk must be driven out of Europe? There have been differences in England as to whether the Kaiser should be

hanged or not, as to whether the Bolsheviks should be let alone or strangled to death, as to whether the terms imposed on Germany are cruel or not; about *one* thing there has been no difference among the British public; they have, with a voice almost unanimous, said: The Turk must go. The great-souled Gladstone was not without 'Christian' prejudices; he raised the cry of a 'bag and baggage policy' against the Turk; that prejudice has spoken through the English clergy, has spoken even through that fine scholar whom I least expected to adopt a fanatical attitude in the matter, the great and gifted author of 'The American Commonwealth,' Lord Bryce; that prejudice has spoken through the English press. "Every Christian with any respect for Christian authority," wrote an 'eminent traveller' in *The Times*, "wishes to see Sophia restored to Christianity." "Turkish rule in any form or under any pretext," wrote Lord Bryce in *The Contemporary Review*, "must absolutely vanish from the lands it has ruined." Yet another made this passionate appeal: "Comrades of the Great War, and all ex-service men! did your comrades suffer and die at grim Gallipoli

in order to keep the Turk at Constantinople? Christians! act for your faith." Be it said to the credit of Mr. Montagu, a Jew, that he lifted up his voice against these crusaders. "It is a horrible slander," he said, "which has appeared in some advertisements and in newspaper articles that to leave the Sultan in Constantinople is to betray those who died in Gallipoli. Indians fought and died in Gallipoli besides soldiers from other parts of the Empire. But they fought a war of liberation; they fought to beat the King's enemies." But how many Montagus are there in the public life of England to-day? *The Star* wrote: "The Turk as a ruler ought to be turned out of Europe bag and baggage"; and here are words taken from another English paper: "There was not a man in the great armies we sent to Gallipoli and Palestine, or in the Mediterranean fleet, who did not know that our dual objects were to put an end for ever to Turkish misrule in Europe, and to rescue the oppressed nationalities in Asia Minor from the blighting influence of the Imperial Ottoman Government." It would be difficult for an average 'soldier' to distinguish this 'rescue effort' against 'the

Imperial Ottoman Government' from a 'crusade against Islam'; nor could the agitation of the Anglican hierarchy be easily distinguished from a 'crusade against Islam'. That the Sultan is allowed at all to be in Constantinople—under 'protection' of foreign guns—is due to the pressure of France which, like Great Britain, has motives of a character by no means altruistic.

But Turkey, the Premier says, 'suddenly declared war on us,' 'suddenly slammed the gates in the face of an old ally who had always stood by her, and who had no quarrel with her of any sort or kind at the time'! 'There was no understanding whatever with Russia to the detriment of Turkey'! and 'Turkey had no reason to fear anything'! The Premier chooses to forget that Turkey was practically forced into the War. England stood on the side of the Czar, and Russia had an ancient hatred for Turkey. 'England,' says a Japanese writer, 'had refused when asked to become the protector of Turkey.' Turkey feared Russia; she feared the guns of the *Breslau* and *Goeben*; this double fear of Russia and Germany drove Turkey into the War. Indian Muslims asked

the Young Turks not to stand against England in the War. The appeal was not heeded; and in the early days of the Great War, as *The Times* confessed, Mr. Asquith's government promised Constantinople to Russia. Turkey went on fighting *in fear*. Now, says the Premier, 'Turkey has been beaten' and, must 'pay the penalty for defeat'! 'Justice she will get,' he adds; 'Austria has had justice; Germany has had justice—pretty terrible justice!' 'Why should Turkey escape?' Apparently, the Premier would follow the oft-misunderstood maxim: "Justice! though the heavens fall!" But 'justice' which does not make for *reconciliation* is irrational, and does hideous wrong to humanity. 'Pretty terrible justice' has but one logical end—Bolshevism! Europe's need, the nations' piteous need, is world-reconciliation. You may cripple Turkey to-day; but your *karma* will come back to you, one day; such is the Law. Methinks the eminent thinker of Belgium had this insight when he said: "In politics every thing passes away; but it comes back in *history*." And the fate of Turkey will, in no small measure, make the future of the East and, therefore, the future of the world.

As far as one can see at this moment, to partition Turkey is to stir the very depths of Islam; and Islam is international. Indian Muslims and Egyptian Muslims and the Muslims of Russia and Morocco and Persia and Afghanistan and Asia Minor will, with bitter memories, remember the 'pretty terrible justice' as an insult to the Caliph and to Islam. Which of the nations would like to reap the awful harvest of Asiatic unrest? Weak, you say, are the Muslim powers against the might and majesty of modern Europe; Weak—; therefore, I say, take heed. 'Beware of the tears of the weak,' says an ancient Indian Scripture. Already the weak throughout the East, the Hindus and Muslims in India and Egypt and Persia and Algeria and Afghanistan, smart under a sense of domination by the selfish, aggressive imperialism of the West. That sense will only be deepened by the downfall of Turkey. The Eastern knows, however reluctant he be to express it, that 'protection' and 'mandates' which the Powers of Europe are so anxious to exercise, are only a part of Europe's diplomatic designs to dominate, control and exploit the East in the interests of a

soulless, economic imperialism. England wants Mesopotamia; France desires to have Syria; Italy is anxious to dominate southern Asia Minor; Arabia's independence of Turkey will only mean its dependence on European Powers; England's attitude to Persia indicates her anxiety to penetrate that historic land of Hafiz and Omarkhyam; and to drive out the Turk from fair and fertile Thrace and his other 'homelands' will only help Europe's process of financial penetration in the East,—'In the interests of civilisation,' Mr. Lloyd George would say. The unashamed lies of Europe's diplomacy, the greed of its imperialism, the hate and passion of its politics are a sad commentary on the 'civilisation' which Europe would impose on the weaker nations of the East. Such a 'civilisation' is a revolt against the soul of man; such a 'civilisation' threatens to sweep over the East with the fall of Islam and the passing of Eastern nations within Europe's 'spheres of influence'. The way to meet Europe's challenge, however, is not hate and strife, but the Way of Virtue which Hindu books have called *Dharma*, which in Muslim books is named *Islam*. For Islam means 'homage to the Will of God,' as

Dharma means 'duty to Humanity'. Dharma, Islam, understood thus will, I am convinced, be a light to take us safe through the future before us; and I would have the Indian Muslim take courage in the beautiful thought of the text in the Koran: 'What has happened to thee is also in the Road of God.'

THE KHILAFAT AND THE TASK OF TO-DAY

What do the peace terms mean to Islam, to India, to Asia, to the cause of culture and civilisation? Are not the stars and the skies troubled too, as our hearts are troubled? Is there no trouble in the Heart of Eternal Justice? It is because I believe this 'Peace' troubles the Great Heart, that I believe this settlement cannot long endure.

It is a brutal peace this, a Carthaginian peace; not a peace of *kismet* this, but a peace of *katal* (ruin); it means the ruin of nations. The 'Peace' imposed on the vanquished by the Allies has meant starvation in Central Europe; how many children died of hunger in Austria, in Hungary, in Germany because of the blockade by the Allies? This peace throws financial burdens on Central Europe too heavy for the nations to bear. This 'Peace' lets Europe

dominate Asia. This Peace does not bring with it the waters of healing.

What are we to do now, you ask? Let me tell you two or three things concerning what I think should be our programme of work at present. And first, I ask you to *agitate.* I cannot think this Peace Treaty can last long; the terms it imposes on the vanquished are impossible; a revision is what the world will, I believe, demand more and more. Therefore agitate. Let meetings be held in every town and every village. The Khilafat question is, to my mind, much more important than that of the Reforms; it is *the* national question of the day; and all should press its national importance on the attention of the country.

In the next place, we should *organise.* An efficient organisation is essential to the success of any agitation. Therefore have I asked Hindus to give their Muslim brethren not sympathy only but also their *support.* Muslims and Hindus should stand together as members of one organisation. And such an organisation should be not merely Indian, but international. There are some in England and France and Italy and Japan and the United States who are

in sympathy with the Khilafat cause. A world-organisation supported by thoughtful, earnest men—men who believe in the essential brotherhood of nations—can make, I believe, an effective appeal to world-conscience, and secure a fulfilment of the Premier's solemn pledges now shamelessly passed over in the Peace Settlement.

Above all, I ask all to practise *tapasya.* I am one of those foolish men who believe in the wisdom of the past; and in the Scriptures the teaching is given, again and again, that with *tapasya* comes *power*. In the ancient story of Rama we read of what Rama's father, King Dasaratha, told Rama and Sita on the night previous to the day fixed for Rama's coronation at Ayodhya. Did Dasaratha ask Rama and Sita to pass the night in ease and enjoyment? No; he asked them to spend it in *tapasya*, pointing out to them that with *tapasya* would come to them a mighty power. It is *tapasya* the nation needs at this hour. Seek ye *tapasya*; and all things will be added unto you. The power of agitation can only come if we practise it not in anger or hate but in the spirit of *tapasya.* And I say this to make it clear to you that the

path of Non-co-operation is not a path of ease or comfort. Do not stand on the path if you are not prepared to suffer. Throw up titles and honours; throw up civil posts; buy *swadeshi* things in preference to those of other countries; refer over your disputes to arbitration boards of your own choosing; stand undefended by a counsel if you are dragged by the *sircar* to its courts; choose right men, men of judgment and sacrifice, to speak for you and represent you in the activities and institutions of the nation. All this will mean trouble, hardship, sacrifice. Are you prepared to suffer and serve—to suffer with the strength of self-control, to suffer with patience, to suffer and do nothing to retaliate, nothing to violate the law of social brotherhood?

But, I am asked, what results can this achieve? What results has the Khilafat movement achieved? Is it not futile, now that the Peace Settlement is announced, to persist in the struggle? You can unsettle the settlement, I say, if you *agitate* and *organise* in the spirit of *tapasya*. You will not succeed in a week or a month; the struggle may continue for some years; but as sure as the sun rises in the

East, justice will be done you if you will but stand together in the spirit of *tapasya*. You ask for results? Do you forget what the Khilafat agitation has achieved already? Is it a small thing to have secured this measure of Hindu-Muslim solidarity? Is it a small thing to have drawn the upper classes and the masses together in the service of the nation? Is it a small thing to have drawn maulvis and sadhus and sanyasins out of their seclusion into the sphere of political service? Is it a small thing, this thrill of the new national life and the new vision of India's destiny which Muslims and Hindus experience at this hour? Yet more results can be achieved; only stand together in the spirit of *tapasya*. You say you are in sorrow; I ask you to let hope enter the heart of your sorrow; I ask you to let the light of faith illumine the darkness of the day. Make your sorrow a mighty motive force; and use your very defeat for the service of your just cause. In the Report of the Congress Enquiry Committee is recorded among others the evidence of the Hon. Mr. Raizada Bhagat Ram. He met Sir Michael O'Dwyer at Lahore soon after the *hartal* at Jullundur. Sir Michael

enquired what sort of *hartal* they had; Mr. Bhagat Ram said the *hartal* was complete and there was no disturbance! Sir Michael asked what that was due to; Mr. Bhagat Ram said it was due to Mr. Gandhi's soul force. Sir Michael was irritated; he raised his fist and said: "Remember there is another force greater than Gandhi's soul force." Therein lay the blunder of Sir Michael; he believes not in soul force but in physical force; he ought to have known, what the world's great teachers have taught, that there *is no force* greater than *soul force.* In the struggles and strivings of the coming days, see to it that you do nothing to compromise the spiritual ideal, nothing to surrender your soul force. This is what I understand more and more as the delusions of early days are falling from my eyes, that there is nothing which you cannot achieve with the powers within you.

So I ask you to have faith in yourselves. Agitate, organise, but do it with *tapasya*; do it as citizens of the Kingdom of the Spirit that is mightier than all kingdoms of the earth. Of a Christian saint it is said he knelt and prayed asking with a passionate cry: 'Where

art Thou, O God?' And there came to him a voice saying: "I thy Lord am there down among the people." In the people has Allah established His Throne; therefore I ask you to believe in yourselves, to recognise the powers slumbering within you. Wake them up with *tapasya*; then bring them into play in the field of national service; and you will help India on her pilgrimage of achievement.

HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY

THE Congress Committee's Report on the Jallianwalla tragedy deserves to be translated into the vernaculars of every Province. I could recount incident after incident bearing upon that story of the massacre of innocents. But it would stir the blood, and I have always tried to keep out every thought of anger or ill-will. Salute with me the martyrs of the 13th April, 1919, and know that the day is sacred. This day, the 13th April, will, I hope, be observed year after year, throughout the length and breadth of India. I think of it as a day of God's *kathor kripa*, a day of the nation's suffering through which has been developed a purpose of the Spirit of History.

History is enacted first in the hearts of men, then flung on the fields of space outside. On the 13th of April history was enacted in India; that history lives in our hearts and will carry its message and inspiration to our children and

children's children. The 13th of April saw Indian unity sealed with Hindu-Muslim blood.

Travelling through Europe, I asked several of those I met in the train: Who are you? One said he was an Italian, another that he belonged to the German fatherland, another that she was a Swiss, another that he was of Ireland, another that he was a Welshman. Then I remembered with sadness that in India they answer the question differently; 'I am a Brahmin,' says one; 'I am a Kshatriya,' says another. I remembered that in Sind they say: 'I am an Amil,' 'I am a Bhaibund,' 'I am a Hyderabadi,' 'I am a non-Hyderabadi'; and my heart, in a protest of sorrow, asked: Why will they not say, 'We are Indians. We are servants of Bharat. We are children of the *punya bhumi*?' That was in 1910. To-day things move on to nobler ends; to-day we celebrate Hindu-Muslim unity. While paying homage to the martyrs, we ask for justice—yet not in the European sense of that word. Justice in the higher sense is not *retributive* but *healing*; and what we want is that to Dyer and O'Dwyer and other official offenders in the great tragedy may be done justice such as may in some

measure heal the wounds inflicted on humanity on the 13th April. The name of Jallianwalla will live in the heart of India, and the new national temple will rise as a rich memorial to the new spirit which, plucking strength out of sorrow, has re-established Hindu-Muslim unity. The Hindu-Muslim unity I have in view is not of the platform but of practical, every-day life. It is easy to meet together and talk; what is needed is to meet together on a common platform of action. Let Hindu and Muslim volunteers work together in various spheres of social service, work together when there are outbreaks of influenza or plague or cholera or malaria. Again, the condition of the peasants in our villages is pitiable; let Hindus and Muslims work together to help the peasants out of their present state. The majority of these peasants are Muslims; their education, economic efficiency and social betterment should be a matter of concern not alone to the Muslims but also to the Hindus. Then there are quarrels between Hindus and Muslims, especially in small place; many of these disputes are dragged to law courts whose work is multiplied from year to year and has to be paid

for from the public purse. Why not appoint Joint Arbitration Boards, consisting of respected leaders of the two communities, to settle many of these disputes? Then, again, the Sindhi weaver is in a sad state; he finds no market for his things, and Sindhi weaving may soon become a lost art; it should be our duty to come to the help of the starving Sindhi weaver; and this we can do only by encouraging Sind *swadeshism*. Years have passed since, at the first Provincial Political Conference, held at Sukkur, I appealed to my countrymen to take the *swadeshi* vow; the assembly stood up in the pandal and took the vow in an impressive manner. Alas! the enthusiasm was over soon; the vow was forgotten; the *swadeshi* spirit suffered a rude check. How many in Sind to-day are pledged to the *swadeshi* creed? I ask all Sindhis to renew the *swadeshi* vow and keep it sacred for the highest interests of the Province. The people will continue to be poor as long as they allow their economic resources to be exploited for the benefit of Lancashire and Manchester. From weakness to weakness will the people wander as long as they prefer foreign goods to their own; and neither Sind nor

India can advance politically or socially as long as the majority of the people remain in poverty. The more I have thought of this, the more have I felt that in *swadeshism* is the salvation of India.

It is true, that Europe gives us, for the moment, cheaper things; but these cheap things are nasty, and prove costly in the long run. Let us resolve to buy things dear from our people that in the long run we, our children and our children's children, may have cheap things and beautiful things in the highest interests of the nation. It is high time for Hindus and Muslims to co-operate to strengthen the *swadeshi* movement.

Yet another way to promote the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity is to speak of it to boys and girls in our schools. Early impressions last the longest; and we should impress the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity on the minds of students. It may be difficult to do it in schools controlled by Government; but you have private schools, national schools; and students growing in the atmosphere of unity will, in the years of their manhood, help the national movement.

The Khilafat cause is a national one; in this and in all other matters bearing upon national

advance, Hindus and Muslims will co-operate in the measure in which they believe in Hindu-Muslim unity. Friends come and say to me: "What are you doing? What do you gain by your sympathy with the Khilafat cause?" Is friendship, I ask, based on motives of gain? Is not *dosti* (friendship) different from *dukandari* (bargain)? Is it not enough to know that the Khilafat cause is just? But do not, I am told by friends, be with the Muslims unless you see the whole way clearly? When, I ask, did true love see the whole way clearly? And what room is there for faith when you see the whole way clearly? Is it not enough to see only that each step you take is right and leave the issues to God? The *sircar bahadur* in Sind may procure me prison gates for friendship with the Mussalman; but when did prison walls imprison a man? And never forget that life's secret is not in its gains, but its losses; not in what you get, but what you give. Life's strength grows out of the depths of suffering; and the highest thing to do is to worship the Ideal. I ask Hindus and Muslims then to stand together. I ask them to stand together in social service, in political work, in their sorrows and struggles

and strivings for a better order in official-ridden Sind. I ask them to stand together, but with anger against none. I ask them to stand together, but not in pride. In that wonderful book—one of the greatest in the world's mystical literature—the famous Muslim Poet Jellal-u-Din Rumi—the author of *Masnavi*—has a beautiful passage in which he says: 'We are God's captives.' We have long been captives to money and honours and the *sircar's* titles, and the selfish creed of comfort and ease; and see the state of India! I ask all Hindus and Muslims to be no longer captives to the world. I ask them in the splendid words of the Persian mystic, to become 'God's captives'; and there is no power on earth that can prevail against them and the mighty purpose of the national movement.

ONE FELLOWSHIP

I do not belong to any political group, because the problem of India, as I see it, is not political simply, but also economic, social, spiritual. But my sympathies are with my Muslim fellow-countrymen for several reasons. And first, because they are Indians. It was one of their great leaders, Mr. Tyabji of Bombay, who said with deep earnestness: "We are Indians first, and Mussalmans afterwards." And what is true of the Muslims is equally true of the Hindus. They are Indians first, and Hindus afterwards. As an Indian, then, I sympathise with my fellow-Indians, in national and religious sorrow.

My sympathies are with them also because they are children of Islam. My faith taught me, years ago, to see the greatness of Islam; and for years I have forgotten all differences between Hindus and Muhammadans. Under the grace of Him—the Saviour of the nations, the maker of a Great India, a Maha Bharata—there

is being builded a new temple for the service of the nation. Into that temple are we all to enter—Hindus and Muslims and Parsis and Christians—all who call India their Mother. In that temple we are all to pay homage to the prophets and patriots of the world. And Mahomed is one of them. Say not he is Islam's alone; Mahomed is ours too, as the Aryan rishis and munis are not of the Hindus only; they belong to the Muslims as well. Of the singular beauty of Mahomed's life it is difficult to speak with exaggeration. Not without reason did one write concerning him—'I have seen the Persian Chroses, and the Greek Heracles, but never did I see a man ruling his people with the sympathy of Mahomed.' For that sympathy you plead at this hour of your need. And the secret of Mahomed's sympathy—was it not his consciousness that he was really a servant of his people? 'I sit at the meals as a servant doeth,' he said, 'and I eat as a servant, for I am really a servant.' Is it any wonder that such a man left behind him a mighty influence, a rich inspiration, and Islam entered on a great career of civilisation after he passed away? Islam became the torch-bearer of culture at a time

when mediæval Europe was in darkness. Islam taught the Europe of that age medicine and science and architecture. Islam established the famous universities of Cordova and Cairo where Christian students sat side by side with Muslims to study science and literature and arts. Muslim scholars translated Hindu books in Arabic, and Islam interpreted Aryan philosophy and culture in some of the western seats of learning. Nor can I forget what Islam has done for India. Islam has been—say what the critics will—one of the nationalising forces in India. Muslims are inheritors of a great culture and civilisation; and it is natural for me to sympathise with them at this hour of their sorrow.

I sympathise with them also because their cause is just. The Khilafat has passed from Arabia to Cairo, from Cairo to Damascus, from Damascus to Baghdad, from Baghdad to Constantinople; but the Khalifa has always been elected by the elders, the Ulemas, and has always been the Protector of the Holy Lands of Islam. The Khalifa has been the head of Islam in matters civil and religious. What more natural for Muslims than to ask that the Holy

Places should continue to be under the protection of their Khalifa? They are not against any grant of autonomy to Arabia. I would not object to autonomy being granted to some other parts also of the Sultan's dominions. Home Rule is, I believe, the birthright of every country; but they naturally desire that autonomy should be within the Turkish Empire, as there are people who wish that India and Ireland should enjoy autonomy within the British Empire.

They talk of Turkish misrule. I must speak the truth as I understand it; and I cannot justify Turkey's treatment of Armenian Christians. But Turkey is, I believe, wiser after the War. They who talk of Turkish misrule with a view to seeing Turkey partitioned among the European Powers may well be asked: Are the records of the nations of Europe clean? In the third year of the War, an Englishman, speaking in a London hall, dwelt at length on 'Turkish misrule'; and several of those present resented the speaker's remarks. The Englishman went on speaking of 'Turkish misrule,' when a gentleman put the question: "What about England's rule in Ireland?" And may not some in this

country ask the critics of Islam a similar question: 'What about England's rule in India?' Stainless only is the scripture which Nature writes every day with the light of the stars and the colours of the flowers and which is hymned by the birds of the air and the *bulbul* in spring; but the records of one nation's dealings with another have been stained again and again with dark deeds. The Armenian-Turkish question is a difficult one; and I personally wish the Armenian Christians were granted autonomy. But I fail to understand why any European power should be given a mandate over any part of the Sultan's dominions, or why any Muslim country should be handed over to Greece or Bulgaria—the enemies of Turkey. We have but to read the Carnegie International Report to know how the Muslims were massacred in Macedonia when Turkey lost the last Balkan war; and we have read of how the Muslims have been massacred by Greeks in Smyrna. I would not have the Turks bully other people; but neither would I have Europe bully the Turks. And the Turks have been painted in very dark colours by interested critics. In a recent issue

of the New York *Outlook*, I read a frank statement concerning the Turks; it was written by the staff correspondent of that journal; he stayed among the Turks for some time; and this is what he wrote of them: 'I found them what most foreigners who visit Turkey find the Turks to be in private life—kind, courteous, honest, brave and always ready with a laugh.' 'In fact,' added Mr. Gregory Mason, the staff correspondent, 'most foreigners in Turkey prefer the Turks socially to the other prevailing races there, the Jews, Greeks, Kurds and Armenians.'

This agitation is not against Peace—we wish there were peace and good-will among all the nations;—the agitation is against *particular terms* of the Peace; and for a modification of the peace terms. This agitation, I say, is not only valid, constitutional; it is a distinct, definite, solid service done to the Imperial Government; it will indicate how strong, how united, how universal is the Muslim's righteous resentment at a settlement which threatens the future of Islam and the dignity of your Khalifa. And I would ask my Muslim brethren to be

loyal to their higher selves in all their agitation; to let no passion, no thought of strife into their hearts. Let them agitate—but as servants of the Truth that has malice towards none, but love for every one who bears the divine image of man. It may be they will be unable to prevent the consummation of the threatened crime of Europe against the Caliph-Sultan. But, surely, it is something to have recorded their protest. And that protest will pass from generation to genertion, will pass on to their children and their children's children, until justice is done to Islam and history justifies the resolve and resolution of the Khilafat movement.

A FRAGMENT FROM A SCHOLAR-PATRIOT

THE History of Sind is yet to be written. Part of it may be traced in the archæological remains; part of it is enshrined in the proverbs and customs and folk-tales and songs of the Sindhi peasant; part of it exists in the old chronicles left by Greek and Muslim and Hindu and European writers. Some fragments fetched from some of these old chronicles I interpreted sometime ago. Another fragment I wish to interpret here, indicating specially the picture it gives us of Sind as she was at the beginning of the eleventh century. Sind was then in Muslim hands. Muslims have had a strange fascination for the desert; 'as for the town's people, God has no thought of them,' said one of them! They did feel the fascination of Sind; and it was in Sind they planted the standard of Islam before marching on to other provinces in India. A Muslim traveller who visited

Hindustan in the eleventh century has recorded a few impressions of Sind. He was a liberal Muslim—(a true Muslim is liberal; Islam was not meant to be intolerant.) And Abu Raihan—for that is the name of the Muslim traveller—takes to task those who called themselves Muslims, yet trampled upon the great civilisation of Iran; he reproaches the Ghazni who would convert the Hindu at the point of the sword. He is a scholar and has the true scholar's modesty and sincerity; he is not, he says, a friend of the man who cannot frankly say: 'I do not know'! He appreciates the Hindu view of the place of memory in education, telling us that he believes knowledge is a fruit of repetition. He is a patriot; his native place, Khiva, is conquered by Mahmud of Ghazni; the conqueror patronises the great scholar; but not for any material reward will Abu Raihan be reconciled to the conqueror of his native place. Mahmud dies; the scholar-patriot refers to him simply as the 'Amir Mahmud,' and is not afraid to tell the truth that Mahmud Ghazni 'utterly destroyed India's prosperity,'—'scattering the Hindus like atoms of dust in all directions'! His political philosophy

rests on the great Muslim idea that "all men are equal," and he has genuine sympathy with the Hindu. For Hindu scholars he has great admiration: they too, he says, have the 'help of God'. He regards them as inspired no less than Muslim scholars; and he quotes with joy the words of the great Buddhist scholar, Varahamihira, who asked the people to honour alike the Greek and the Brahmin if they were men of culture. The Greeks, said Varahamihira, were foreigners, but 'they must be honoured since they were trained in sciences'. The Brahmin had a creed different from that of the Buddhist; but he too must be honoured, said Varahamihira, if he 'combined with his purity of life the culture of science'. Abu Raihan appreciates Hindu philosophy and understands, what most even of the modern European writers on India have not, that Hinduism is essentially *monotheistic*. What this cultured Muslim writes concerning Sind has thus a value which cannot be overrated.

Speaking of Mahmad-bin-Kassim's conquest of Sind, he says the Arab invader conquered the cities of Al-Mansur and Al Ma'mura. Al-Mansur is also referred to as Mulsthana, of which

Multan is a modern corruption; but I have not been able to identify the other city, Al-Ma'mura. One thing, however, seems clear, that the Sind Raj extended, in those days, to Mulsthana or Multan. At one time, indeed, the Kingdom of Sind extended as far as Kashmir! Abu Raihan tells us the Muslims called the river Sindhu, Mahran—a name of fragrant associations in the poems of Shah Latif; and he proceeds to correct an error of Aljahiz who regarded Mahran as a branch of the Nile! The Indus, like the Nile, had crocodiles; and Aljahiz by a false inference made one a branch of the other! Abu Raihan also tells us that the sea into which the Indus flows at Kutch was named the *Sindhu Sagar*. Sind and Kutch, we know, have had commercial dealings with each other for centuries. Sind had dealings also with the Afghans who, we are told by Abu Raihan, "extended to the neighbourhood of the Sind valley". The Afghan has been the Sindhi's neighbour, if also his opponent, from time to time; and rather than make Sind a section of the Province of the Punjab, I would have a Greater Sind by linking our province with Quetta and other British possessions in the

land of the Afghan and the Baluch. The Sindhi's contact with the vigorous mountaineers of those places would do them and him good.

The alphabets used in Sind in the eleventh century, Abu Raihan tells us, were (1) *ardhanagri* and (2) *nagara*; the first alphabet was in use in Kashmir, Kanouj and Aryavarta—the home in those days of Indian science and culture; the second was in use in Malwa. Both these were used in Sind, the second in Southern Sind, the first in other parts of the province. Hindi script was thus practically the one script of Sind even in those days of Muslim domination. We read also that the Sindhis were fine players at chess. "They play four persons at a time—with a pair of dice," says Abu Raihan; and it is interesting to find a Muslim writer praise chess as a game which has a tendency to 'quicken understanding—if *not* played for a stake'!

Sind had dealings with some of the great Khalifas of the Muslim empire. We read of Khalifa Mauviya who sold the golden gods of Sicily to Sindhi princes. We read of Sind's influence on Khalif Mansur and his famous court at Baghdad. Scholars of Sind went there

with two great books, *Brahmasidhanta* and *Khandakhadyaka*; they interpreted the scientific teachings of the books to Muslims at Baghdad; the first book was translated into Arabic and was named *Sindhind*; the book gives Brahmagupta's view of a system of astronomy. So it was that Muslims learnt from Sindhi scholars a system of astronomy which later the Arab professors taught in some of the great universities of mediæval Europe. It was Sindhis, again, who were chief physicians at the hospitals of Baghdad; and in several political missions which went from India to the Khalifs of Baghdad, Sindhi members played a conspicuous part.

Islam did not drive out Buddhism, the faith which had found a congenial soil in Sind. The Buddhist monks called *Sranamas* wore red robes, and are referred to in the Muslims' language as *almahawrah* which means, literally, the '*red-robed people*'. It is gratifying to note also that Abu Raihan speaks in appreciative terms of the Sind Muslims. They were not, he observes, bigoted or fanatical as were Muslims in some other parts of India. Toleration, hospitality, simplicity, idealism are among the primal

instincts of the Sindhi; hence it is that Sufism and in later days the *bhakti* school of religion found a congenial soil in Sind. Abu Raihan, it is interesting to note, refers to Sufism and is careful to point out that the word must *not* be connected with *suf* (the wool of goats) but with *saf* (pure), or better still, with the Arabic word corresponding to the Greek word *sophia* which means wisdom. The true sufi, the mystic, the lover of God is the wise man. Such men Sind had in the long ago; such men Sind must have again to shape her thought and public life if she is to enrich with her gifts the life of the modern world. The woman-soul has been the great guardian of idealism through the ages; and it is significant to read in the pages of Abu Raihan that the people of this land "in all consultations and emergencies take the advice of the women". What part does the Sindhi woman play in our public life to-day? Within the veil she sits, yet not without a longing and a dream of what she can do to serve the nation at this hour of its destiny. I know of no other literature in the world so eloquent with the longing of the woman-soul as the songs and stories of Sind. The *kafis* of Sindhi poets,

the poems of Shah Latif, are an outpouring of the love and sorrow which have their home in the woman-heart. The noblest thoughts, the loveliest visions of the ideal, the richest appreciations of the Divine values of life are associated by Sindhi poets with the woman's quest of love; and some of the loveliest lyrics in world-literature are in the Sindhi language and are put in the mouths of Sindhi women. Read that wondrous love-lyric of Latif, named "Suhni"—a poem which is charged through and through with the beauty of the thought that life blossoms in and through suffering, self-renunciation, death. With the vision of love in her heart, with morning in her eyes, Suhni plunges into the deep at the dark hour of the night to meet her love on the other side; and in the transience of those eternal moments she utters the words which I can only render in very imperfect English thus: "I cannot hoard my life; I needs must plunge into the deep; let me be a sacrifice to love." And in the women of the country of Suhni is still *her* spirit; only give them opportunities to grow; only break the bondage they are in; and some of them coming out of their seclusion will yet help in breaking India's

bonds. Municipal and civic and political life will be purer, nobler, when enriched by the intuition, sympathy, and idealism of Sindhi women. They can do much to help the *swadeshi*; the national movement in Sind will be all the stronger when nourished by their faith and devotion. Blessed, indeed, is the country where "in all consultations and emergencies they take the advice of the women". For woman is a symbol of sacrifice; and it is the woman-soul of Sind, with her dream to sing of national freedom, that yearns for some supreme act of self-renunciation, saying: "I cannot hoard my life; I needs must plunge into the deep; let me be a sacrifice to love."

CONCERNING KHILAFAT

THE KHILAFAT cause really is not merely Muslim; it is, in a sense, a national cause; it involves issues affecting the future of the East. Every Indian should have sympathy with the Khilafatist cause on this one ground, if on no other, that if the just claims of Islam are crushed, the East will have less power to repel the advance of European imperialisms.

The one question, as it seems to us, of supreme importance to-day is that of Britain's attitude to Islam. Mr. Sastri speaking at the Imperial Conference said the matter of first importance was the rights of the Indians within the Empire; more important than that, as it seems to us, is the Khilafat question. For if a united India can, in this matter, make its demand irresistible, it will have shown a power which Britain will be bound to respect; and once respect for Indian opinion is awakened,

the question of equal rights within the Empire will be easily solved. In a sense, indeed, it is true that to solve the Khilafat problem to the satisfaction of Hindu-Muslim India will be, largely, to solve the *swaraja* problem; for there is no *swaraja* until the people have the power to impress their will upon the administration.

Mr. Churchill has returned to expound his dream of a 'second empire' in the East. The anxiety of England to secure an Anglo-Persian agreement, to retain Egypt, to remain in Mesopotamia, to have a hold upon Arabia—is the anxiety of imperialism to control the Orient. "The policy," said Mr. Churchill the other day, "which we must continue to pursue was to secure a real and lasting peace with Turkéy." *Real and lasting peace with Turkey*;—is such a peace possible without respecting Muslim sentiment and securing the integrity of the Khilafat? Do the British statesmen really mean a 'real and lasting peace with Turkey'? The *Nation* spoke frankly the other day when it said; "There will be no satisfactory settlement until the European powers mend their ways in the Near East. The pretended concert between

France and Italy and ourselves is a mere farce. We are all pursuing our own narrower interests, using Turks or Greeks in a more or less covert way as our stalking-horses"! And as Britain has its imperialistic designs, so have France and Greece theirs. The imperialisms of Europe must be checked in the highest interests of Eastern culture and civilisation; and this will not be possible if the just Muslim claims are trampled upon and Islam becomes a dying institution.

Interested parties in India and Europe were in the habit of representing—misrepresenting—the Angora Government as only a banding together of banditism and militarism. To-day, some one of his European critics acclaims Kamal Pasha as a "Liberator"; this young man of forty years born poor but self-made and with a true patriot's courage, is struggling hard to save the honour of Islam and is busy to-day recovering Asia Minor for Turkey. The Angora Government under him has already proved to be a civilised, humanising agency. It has organised a university; it has created an elected Assembly; it has enfranchised women; it has strengthened nationalism in Muslim lands;

it has stood up bravely for the rights and freedom of Islam. Its Premier explained its policy in a recent statement thus: "We shall continue the fight for our complete political, economic, financial and military independence. We are convinced that the day is not far distant when the land of our forefathers will be free. We do not refuse peace, but we demand the right to live and to safeguard our independence. All our physical and moral powers are at the service of the defence of our country." The statement breathes a noble spirit of patriotism. In this struggle of Angora against Greece, Britain should maintain its attitude of neutrality, and Indian Muslims must not, in the best interests of India, resolve upon lifting up the sword in defence of Islamic interests. India's future, as far as we can see, is not with the cult of the sword but with *ahimsa*, non-violence. In non-violent non-co-operation India has launched upon a great experiment; and the experiment cannot succeed without the continued co-operation of Muslims.

THE MESSAGE OF UNITY

In one of his letters recently published in English, the eminent Russian novelist, Tchechov, says: "My God! How rich Russia is in good people." And this poor Province of Sind, I have often felt, is rich in good people. Sind is bothered by heat, by the bureaucrat, and by that creation of the bureaucrat—the demagogue; but Sind is still rich in good people; the Sindhis are made of a splendid stuff. And those in our midst who would help Sind politically should make a study of politics in the light of the needs and thoughts of the Sindhis who do not know English and whom we are wont to call the 'masses'. We do not want politicians who maintain arrogant, aristocratic aloofness from the 'masses' and the poor; we want not supermen but men who will realise their unity with the people and strive for social justice. I believe in the politics of self-help; and my hope is not in an external agency of

reform but in the people themselves. There was a beautiful novel published some years ago; I would recommend it to all young men interested in Indian nationalism. It is named 'Benedict Kavanagh'. The priest in the novel is represented as telling Benedict of the great improvement among the village people. Benedict thinks it is the priest who has made the improvement for the people. 'No,' says the priest, 'I have not done it for them. There you touch the great mistake that has brought to ruin so many fine-sounding schemes . . . Nothing, literally nothing, can be done from outside. Have we not had enough of that? Money poured out, wasted. Strangers coming to teach and going away disheartened. For our people there is only one hope and that is in themselves, themselves alone.' Things are upside down, you say: why? We have detached ourselves from our fellow-men. Let us realise our unity with the great mass; let us receive wisdom from the life of the humble, the poor, the peasant, the labourer, and things will be right again.

There are signs, at this hour, to indicate that this unity is beginning to be dimly discerned. The earnest political workers in our midst have

begun to carry the message of modern politics to the 'masses'; and vernaculars are being substituted for English at our meetings and conferences. But we have yet to produce a vernacular literature vibrant with the new national life; we have yet to return to the simplicity of life to which Indian culture has borne witness through the ages; we are still snatching at the clothes of civilisation and have yet to realise that the price of real progress is a series of sacrifices; we are anxious to be enlightened, but are we true in the heart? And the spring of our patriotism—is it love of applause or enthusiasm for humanity? Sind is a land of villages: do we think of village welfare? Village clubs, village reading-rooms, village libraries, village industries, village temples are needed; who will take up the task and the burden? One thing I am sure of; the city-politician's work will remain unsubstantial until he has the supporting strength of the great mass. And there are several socio-economic problems which cannot be solved without the co-operation of the 'masses' in towns and the village-folk—How to reorganise village Panchayats? How to build up technical schools? How to help the swadeshi movement?

How to organise opinion so as to secure parks and play-grounds, museums and picture-galleries, healthy habitations and clean streets for the benefit of the people? There is but one way—to unite in sympathy and service.

This unity demands, also, the Hindu-Muslim co-operation which is being urged throughout India at this great hour. National advance is impossible without Hindu-Muslim solidarity. Most of the Muslims, like Hindus, are Aryan in race; and still in some of our villages the beautiful spectacle may be seen of Hindus and Muslims living together as good neighbours and friends. Islam has been at work for centuries, and has rendered some real services to the people. The Arabs, the first invaders of Sind, were a people of patriarchal simplicity; they, and later on, the races from Central Asia, from Afganistan and Persia, bore witness to the unity and sovereignty of God; caste was practically banished out of Sind by the Muslim rulers. Followers of the great Prophet who established a democracy in Arabia, the Muslims developed the democratic instincts of the people; and still in villages may be found the Hindu and the

Muslim sitting together in the evening after the day's work is over and rejoicing in common festivities. Islam, too, has something to do with the temperate habits of the Sindhis, intoxicating drinks being prohibited by the Prophet.

The sons of Islam brought to Sind a new system of medicine; they were, also, great students of geography; Ibn Batuta was an eminent geographer; Ali Edrisi was another; the very title of his book is significant; it is called: 'The Delight of those who seek to wander through the regions of the world'; and it was the Muslims who introduced geography into our school-curriculum. Sufism introduced a new lyric note into our song; and one of the world's greatest Sufis was a native of Sind.

The vision beautiful was voiced by Shah Latif; and in his wondrous song Sind spoke after a long period of silence and is, I believe, destined to speak again to the nations. Islamic architecture influenced Hindu builders, the arched form being unknown to the Hindus before the coming of the Muhammadan. Islam enriched Sindhi language with words of Persian and Turkish origin; and through Islam some of the

Hindu books came to the knowledge of Persia, Arabia and Europe. Abul Fazil was a Sindhi: Akbar was born in Umerkot; and Abul Fazul translated Hindu books and Akbar organised the earliest conferences of religion recorded in history. There is a passage in that remarkable letter which the Prince of Udaipur sent to the Moghul Emperor, Aurangzeb: "The Hindu and Muslim stand alike before Him . . . In your mosque it is in His name that the call to prayer is uttered, but in a house of idols where the bell is rung, it is still He that is the object of adoration." Beautiful words these—"The Hindu and the Mussalman stand before Him." The eternal Saviour of the nations has joined us together; let nothing tear us apart. What more natural than that the Muslim sorrow at the threatened partition of the dominions of their Khalifa-Sultan be shared by Hindus? And the Khilafat movement will continue to have Hindu support and sympathy as long as it has the strength of self-control and does not weakly fall into a cult of 'boycott,' 'ostracism,' or 'violence'. Sind needs to-day a band of men moving from village to village and spreading

knowledge of the unity of Muslims and Hindus, the unity of the Sindhi people. In that unity is the honour of our generation and the strength of our future. No separation, comrades! We belong to one another in the One Who is greater than ourselves; we are summoned to be servants of the Mother; we are called—in the noble words of the Sindhi poet—to 'walk the rugged hills with the feet of love'.

THE SITUATION AND SIND MUSLIMS

My Muslim friends are angry with the *sircar* for the recent Press Note against the Khilafat movement in Sind. The hour is too holy for thoughts of anger or counsels of passion. Personally, I am not disappointed as the Note is what I have been expecting for some weeks past. The *sircar* understands that Sind is a Muslim Province. The *sircar* knows that the anti-Khilafat agitation engineered by some Sind officials has failed. The *sircar* has not the short memory several of us have. Several Sind Muslims have thrown up their appointments and honorary posts in the civil service; some of them have renounced their educational grants-in-aid. A *sircar* that believes frankly in force is naturally nervous over the spread of the Khilafat movement among the masses in a province where faith is driving out fear.

In a matter which has stirred the Muslim feeling to its depths, it is difficult for every

speaker to control his feelings; and I confess expressions have, sometimes, been used at Khilafat meetings which I would not approve of. The charge, however, that 'the characteristic feature of these meetings has been the use of language calculated not only to exacerbate racial feeling but to rouse religious passions and foster the spirit of unrest and disorder'—the charge of the *sircar* is unfair. Unrest there is in the heart of the whole country, not Sind alone; unrest will contiune as long as the Khilafat problem is unsolved and the Punjab wound unhealed. But unrest is not rebellion. Religious sentiment has been profoundly stirred; and to express strongly what you feel strongly is human. But it is wrong to say the Khilafat meetings have been characterised by a spirit to stir up racial feeling or disorder. The *sircar's* charge is unfair; but here, again, I am not disappointed. Such charges will be hurled, again and again, at the Movement by a *sircar* which surrenders its judgment to the reports of spies who pursue us silently and swiftly at every step and without compunction cultivate lying as an art that pays.

The *sircar* threatens to press the Seditious Meetings Act against Sind. We have had many meetings, I am afraid too many; much of our strength has, so far, been spent in shouts and talk; we need *concentration* of our energies at this hour in our destiny. If the Act is pressed against any of our meetings let us for the time being obey the magistrates' orders with quiet dignity. Better than public meetings is prayer; and Muslims can, in places where public meetings may be prohibited, spend the day in prayers to the Saviour of the nations. 'More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of.'

The *sircar* will, I fully expect, soon embark upon a more rigorous policy of repression in Sind. The *sircar* will try to break the *morale* of the movement. We must not be disappointed; if we non-co-operate with Government, we may expect Government also to non-co-operate with us. Arrests of some of us will be an item in the programme of repression. Then will be the hour of our testing; then will be our greatest need to exercise self-control. The trial of the movement will begin when the *sircar* throws its challenge

of repression and force. To meet repression with anger and hate, to fling force against force, will be the surest way to break the backbone of the movement. We must meet the *sircar's* challenge with *moral idealism.* The *sircar* will stop our meetings; let it; we do not want more meetings. The *sircar* will send some of us to jail; let it; the fetters are on our feet already. Worse things than the jail may be in store for us. It is not for us to be angry; it is not for us to complain. Nor must we harbour any thought of hate against any Englishman; an Englishman is a *man* and so a member of universal humanity. Our quarrel is with an administration, a policy, not with a person; and in the struggle which awaits us, we must not trample upon the vision of Humanity. Our strength rests in silent suffering; the fire we need is fire in our hearts, not fire on the floor; the force we are to summon is the force of the spirit, not the brute force of the bomb or the sword.

Non-Co-operation really means *co-operation* with the best in us, mentally and spiritually. This is no time for little things—for abuse and hate and passion. In the trying times ahead,

the real contest in Sind will be between authority armed with force, and moral idealism of the Muslims and their Hindu friends. Physical force has been regarded by western thinkers and statesmen as the basis of society and the state; India may yet prove to be the hope of civilisation by showing to a sceptic world that mighty things are achieved by the power of self-suffering and self-denial. We shall not give up the true, clean things; we shall harbour no ill-will in our hearts; we shall worship the Vision of Humanity; we shall oppose to force and race-superiority our patience, our faith, our patriotism, our suffering, our *kurbani*. For, believe me, there is no offering nobler than sacrifice, none more potent and none more acceptable to our ancestors and the heroes of our history.

THE CHALLENGE TO ISLAM

Two of the important resolutions passed at the Khilafat Conference made a fresh declaration of Muslim demands regarding Khilafat and urged that Britain must not, directly or indirectly, render any help to Greece in the latter's campaign against the Angora Government. The Muslims want the integrity of the Khilafat to be maintained, and that Britain shall not, in any way, encourage Greek invasion of the Turkish territory. Are the Muslim demands unreasonable?

In his famous speech on the Middle East question, Mr. Churchill expressed anxiety for "a real and lasting peace with Turkey". How can we secure such a peace? Two things appear to be essential. The first is, England must maintain its neutrality in the struggle between Greece and Turkey. It is true England encouraged Greek imperialism in the East; it is true Mr. Lloyd George said, sometime ago, that the Greeks were England's "natural allies". But England must not forget that it

is the greatest Muslim power to-day and must protect Muslim interests. Greece, I believe, is mistaken in thinking it can crush Turkey. Mustafa Kamal Pasha has, in a short time, worked wonders; the Angora Government has a fine record of work to its credit; and the heroic exploits of its head have inspired the Turks with a new courage and a new faith in the future of Islam. The Greeks have more soldiers than the Turks; but they have little money; and their campaign against Kamal Pasha cannot last long if England will only refuse them all financial aid. The Near East needs peace piteously; it has been the battleground of contending parties since the Balkan War of 1912; the people there are in a sad plight; trade has suffered heavily; the Muslims are starving; and British intervention on behalf of Constantine will only prolong their sufferings; it will not crush them; for the Turks, reawakened under the great leadership of Kamal Pasha, are determined not to surrender their independence; and a people with such determination may be subjected to suffering but cannot be crushed.

The second thing essential to securing "a real and lasting peace with Turkey" is British

acceptance of the Muslim demand in regard to the integrity of the Khilafat. How long can Britain afford to trample upon the religious sentiment of millions of the Muslim world? If only Britain and France and Italy would make up their minds to abandon their imperialistic ambitions in the East, a reasonable settlement with the Muslims could be secured without much delay. Let Britain set an example in giving up its greed and the other two Powers will easily come to terms with Islam. "The behaviour of the three Great Powers ever since the Armistice," wrote an English journal, "has presented a sorry spectacle. We have each pursued our own separate interests; we have bickered and bargained and betrayed. France and Italy have wrung large concessions in Anatolia; Britain has countered by exalting Greece into an Empire. Smyrna and Palestine as well as Constantinople have been the happy hunting ground of western intriguers. Every one of the peoples of the Near and Middle East has been in greater or less degree, the victim of our rivalries and our greeds." Until there is a whole-hearted attempt to abandon these imperialistic intrigues in the East, there can be no real and lasting settlement with Islam.

THE MUSLIM MOOD

The Ali Brothers and Dr. Kichlew made powerful speeches at the Khilafat Conference. They are not half-hearted politicians; they are deadly in earnest; and they feel intensely for Islam. No discriminating critic would, for a moment, doubt that they are ready to go to jail to vindicate the faith in them. They voiced the acute feeling of the Indian Muslim community in regard to the Khilafat; and Britain can commit no greater blunder than to come in conflict with the Muslim sentiment. Islam is a political religion; Islam is a League of many Nations; and to trample upon Islam is to rouse the ire not alone of Turkey, but of the East. Indian Muslims feel that the Sultan-Khalifa is almost a prisoner in other hands; their hope is in Kamal Pasha, the head of the Angora Government; and they have warned Britain against rendering any help, direct or indirect, to Greece against the Angora Government.

I sympathise with the Muslim feeling; I recognise that alike fair dealing and statesmanship should dictate to Britain a policy of neutrality with regard to the Angora Government. The Indian Muslim's demand is reasonable; but their warning, as embodied in the Resolution at the Khilafat Conference, is conceived in a mood which, however natural to many Muslims is, to say the least, unwise. That warning is to the effect that in the event of Great Britain taking sides in the conflict against Angora the Indian Muslims would urge upon the National Congress to hoist the flag of an Indian Republic at Ahmedabad in December. There is, doubtless, much in the idea of an Indian Republic which would fascinate young men; but not everything which fascinates is feasible. An impression seems to have been created upon some in Karachi that Muslim leaders may, at any time, give the word for indulging in 'guerilla warfare'. We may be sure the Muslim leaders will be as good as their word and will stand for non-violence as long as they are associated with the movement. But how long?—we are asked. And there are some who honestly think that non-violent

Non-co-operation will *not* succeed, will not achieve results, will not redress the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs, will not secure us *swaraj*. There are some who point to history and ask if the nations have won freedom without violence. History does not repeat itself; unto each nation its task—which must be done in the strength of its own genius and ideals. It will be a fatal day if India's young men are led to accept a cult of violence.

I believe in *ahimsa*; I believe a peaceful solution of the problem is yet possible; I believe India has nothing to gain but much to lose by being untrue to the creed of non-violence. To her own self let India be true; and she will win the freedom which alone can help the higher life of the nations.

A CALL TO SOLIDARITY

It is essential to the progress of Sind that the Hindu and the Muhammadan should realise their deeper unity one with the other as sons of a common soil. The majority of the people are Muhammadans; and the disruptive tendencies of secular English education which have done harm in some places should be snubbed in Sind. Still in our villages and small towns, the beautiful spectacle may be seen of Hindus and Muhammadans living together as good neighbours, as friends, as helpers one of the other. This co-operation, this attitude of friendliness, this spirit of mutual help should develop all the more with the growth of our new political consciousness.

Islam has been at work in Sind for centuries, and a sympathetic study of the subject will show that Islam has rendered services to the people and the province. The Arabs who were the first invaders of Sind were a people of patriarchal simplicity; they—and later on the

races from Central Asia, from Afghanistan and Persia—bore witness to the unity and sovereignty of God; caste was practically banished by these Muslim rulers of Sind. Followers of the great Prophet who was the first to establish a democracy, the Muslims in Sind developed the democratic instincts of the people; and still in villages may be found Hindu and Muhammadan sitting together in the evening after the day's work is over and rejoicing in common festivities.

Islam too has something to do with the temperate habits of the people of Sind, intoxicating drinks being prohibited by the Prophet. Through the Muhammadans, Sind came in contact with new types of culture and with a vigorous robust civilisation. Davenport in his 'Apology for Mahmood and the Koran' has well observed: 'Arts and sciences flourished among the Arabs for almost six hundred years; while among us rude barbarism reigned and literature was almost extinct.' The sons of Islam brought with them to Sind a system of medicine; they introduced geography and history into the school curriculum; they encouraged literature and 'the golden art of poetry'.

Sufism brought with it its glorious message of beauty; and one of the greatest Sufis was a native of Sind. The vision human, the vision universal was voiced by Shah Latif, and in his wondrous song Sind spoke after a long period of silence, and, I believe, is destined to speak again to the nations of the world. Islamic architecture influenced the Hindu builders—the arched form being unknown to the Hindus before the coming of the Muhammadans. Islam enriched Sindhi language with words of Persian and Turkish origin; and through Islam some of the Hindu books came to the knowledge of countries outside India. For Abul Fazel, let it be remembered, translated Sanskrit books; and Abul Fazel was a Sindhi: is it too much to claim that Akbar—one of the wisest and greatest rulers of the Islamic world—was a Sindhi? Was he not born in Sind?

I do not forget that the Hindus had much to teach the Muhammadans, specially the great virtue of religious toleration which the great Prophet knew full well but which so many of his followers forgot in the stirring period of their progressive march eastward and westward. Was it not the great virtue which the Prince of Udaipur

wished to impress on the mind of the Mogul Emperor Aurangzeb in that remarkable letter: "If your majesty puts any faith in those books by distinction called divine, you might there learn that God is the God of all mankind and not of Mussalmans alone. The Hindu and the Muslim stand alike before Him . . . In your mosques it is in His name that the call to prayer is uttered; but in a house of idols where the bell is rung, it is still He that is the object of adoration."

Beautiful words which the Hindus and Muhammadans should do well to remember. Much have we learnt one of the other in the past in this noble land of Sind. "The Hindu and the Mussalman stand before Him." The Hindu and the Muslim must needs draw closer one to the other in order that they may serve together their common Mother India. There is a beautiful custom observed from time immemorial in the State of Travancore; the Raja there signs all State papers not as the master of the kingdom but as the 'Servant of Padma Nabha Swami,' the 'Servant of the Eternal Lord who dwells in the Lotus'; and the belief still exists among the people that the

raj is not the Raja's but belongs to the Eternal whose servant the Raja is. An able administrator of the State once said: "The constitution of Travancore rests on superstition." If so, surely it is a beautiful superstition; and if all the kings believed that they were 'Servants of the Eternal Lord' the world's Golden Age will run back to bless and beautify the earth. Hindus and Muhammadans you call us—yes, but we are more: we belong to another greater than ourselves: we are called to be servants of the Mother. Freedom needs us: shall we not stand together—the Hindu and the Mussalman?

TO MY MUSLIM FRIENDS

I

I AM in substantial accord with your aspirations. To disturb the integrity and independence of Muslim states for the sake of 'the white man's burden' is at once unwise and immoral. International morality, no less than the dignity of Islam, demands that Muslim countries should determine their own form or forms of government.

II

I earnestly hope the Khilafat Conference will stand strongly for Non-co-operation on the lines of non-violence and *swadeshi*. The honour of Islam and Sind are involved in the decisions of the day. The Mother watches you, my Muslim friends! at this anxious hour; and I pray that your decisions may be taken with no lonely heart but with faith in the Saviour of the nation.

III

Your struggle is ours: and fetters lie heavy on our feet until you, my comrades of the Muslim faith, regain your lost liberty. I trust Muslim friends in Sind will, at every stage in the struggle, show the power of self-control and self-denial, combating persecution with patience, combating fear with faith. Our bodies may be broken in the struggle of the coming days; but, as Sir Galahad in Tennyson's great poem says: "My strength is as the strength of ten because my heart is pure." With song in our hearts, let us give worship to the Allah Who by noiseless paths leads His servants to victory.

IV

I know there is pain in your hearts at this hour, and my heart is not poor in sympathy. Yet I would speak to you the words of hope.

Look into your hearts and find therein the face of India the Mother.

Then read the great history of your past, and carry with you to the masses the power of knowledge and sympathy and self-control.

Your life, on such terms, will not be easy; but believe me, it will be beautiful; and you will have helped India on her pilgrimage of achievement.

V

The peace settlement with Turkey, we are told, is in 'full accordance with high principles'! The 'high principles' of the Allies, indeed, were proclaimed from the house-tops during the War. We are painfully realising now what the 'high principles' mean. They mean that when you win the War, the more you sit upon the vanquished nations, the more 'civilised' you are; they mean that, while speaking of 'self-determination,' you partition the East as it suits your 'enlightened' selfishness; they mean grab, exploitation, mammon worship.

The 'high principles' which inspire the Turkish peace terms are the aims of economic imperialism. Europe's injustice to Turkey and Islam is so great that it must trouble Eternal Righteousness until the postponed equity is adjusted. Independent Muslim states now pass within the 'spheres of influence' of European

powers. Muslim destinies are transferred to non-Muslim powers—to Great Britain, France, Italy, Greece. Constantinople itself—a city which has for centuries been the very heart of Muslim culture and life—a city rightly called Islambol, 'the city of Islam'—Constantinople is 'self-determined' under Allied guns and an Allied Financial Commission! Egypt and Persia and Asia Minor are in the grip of the Great Powers! Masul, the Premier was careful to remind the Commons, was famous for rich oil deposits! There are petroleum fields in Asia Minor; and "the future," as the French Premier said, "would belong to the nation that owned the greatest quantity of petrol"! *Therefore* must England and France secure Asiatic 'mandates'! The attractions of oil are the inspiring motive; the professions of altruism are the mask that diplomacy must wear!

The partition of Turkey adds to the 'White man's burden'; and the blessing of that 'burden' is exploitation of the East! Let world-conscience judge those who now throw over the pledges that they 'did not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race,' and that 'the

Turkish portion of the Ottoman Empire shall be assured a secure sovereignty '.

The Empire of El-Islam falls a victim to old diplomacy, to international injustice, to that economic imperialism which is the Orient's greatest danger to-day. The Turkish settlement is a grab game; it creates an acute, a complicated situation in the East. But I who trust that 'nothing walks with aimless feet,' I believe that out of this evil tangle, too, we may snatch the strands of good. But on one condition, that you and we, Muslims and Hindus, stand together. The struggle is not alone of Muslims and the Islamic faith; it is, I believe, a struggle of Asia, of Oriental culture and humanity.

And the struggle will not be blessed by the Eternal Saviour of the nations if we break, in thought or word or deed, the vow of non-violence. To my Muslim brothers in Sind, then, I wish to say as earnestly as I can to-day —if you lose your heads, you lose the struggle. If you let thoughts of violence enter your hearts, you let the Khilafat wander the way of lost causes. My whole heart goes out to you at this hour when I know your hearts are plunged in profound sorrow; and I ask you to

illuminate the darkness of this day with renewed faith in humanity and the justice of God. Despair is the creed of cowards. Sanity and self-restraint were never needed more than now. The road, I know, is broken behind you; but you must yet go on your way in the spirit of faith and self-control. For to let anything snatch that spirit from your hearts would be to refuse to take up again the march of your Prophet's message.

VI

Some of my Hindu friends I know are frightened by Pan-Islamism. But I cannot think Pan-Islam is opposed to Indian nationalism. As one of our leaders remarked: "The Mussalmans have fought the battle of India shoulder to shoulder with their Hindu brethren. It was left to an Indian Mussalman—Ahmad Mahumad Khan—to fight the battle of India in South Africa and fill the space vacated by her dauntless champion of our rights, Mr. Gandhi." And the battles of India are the battles of freedom. They are the battles of the spirit democratic. It is a spirit essentially in tune with the

cultures and civilisations of Islam and Aryavarta. Hindu India evolved in the dawn of history village panchayats and trade guilds and a poetry and faith charged with the inspiration of freedom. And Islam is essentially democratic. The Arabian kingdom of the Prophet was a republic; and like the Buddha, Mohamad impressed on his comrades the one idea—"I too am a human being". If Islam suffer, the spirit of freedom will suffer in the East; for in the measure that Muslim states lose their independence will European imperialism strangle the spirit of Asia. But I believe in Asia the ancient, I believe her spirit yet will triumph. Islam is international, and when Islam is free, our nationalism is strengthened by all the strength of an international faith.

VII

Cecil said that 'Turkey has shown in this incapacity for ruling subject races'. This remark I find is unduly quoted by opponents of your cause. That such a remark should come from the mouth of an English imperialist! Has England shown any great capacity for ruling

subject races? The Englishman blundered into an empire; and his rule in the East has been a series of blunders, sometimes approaching catastrophes averted only by accidents. Non-co-operation is India's trumpet voice to tell the world that England misrules India.

The attitude of Europeans to Turkey, indeed, has seldom been one of sympathy. It is regrettable that the West has forgotten the contributions of Islam to European civilisation. Very few among European statesmen and thinkers have cared to take note of what Spanish Islam did for the honour of the West. Nor have they shown a desire to examine sympathetically the teaching of the Prophet and its relation to the new world order. The Church of England still retains in one of its prayers a clause concerning the Turk which no Muslim will appreciate. And so great a poet as Mazzone was keen upon wiping Turkey off the map of Europe. Senator Lodge of the United States, speaking on the subject of 'a just and righteous peace,' said some time ago: "We must not be beguiled into concessions to Turkey . . . .; it would be a miserable outcome to have Turkey

retained in Europe, a curse to her subjects and neighbours."

But the Spirit of the Universe is just and will not, I believe, let Europe wipe Turkey off the new map of civilisation. The unethical motive of Great Britain seems clear to my mind. English writers and statesmen frankly desire to extend the sphere of England's influence in Palestine and the new Arabian state! Mr. Sidebottam, the author of *England and Palestine*, expresses the feelings of a number of Englishmen when he urges that Palestine must be dominated by England; he expresses his anxiety in the following significant words: "Egypt is our master-interest in the East not so much because Egypt is valuable to this country as because it is the main channel of our communications with our Indian empire. To say that Egypt is our master-interest in the East is to say that Palestine is our master-interest, for Palestine now as always is the key to Egypt." Yet *The Times* told the Egypt public that the Indian Muhammadans were rather unnecessarily disturbed about the question of the Khilafat and the fate of Turkey!! Keep up the Khilafat struggle with courage and keep it within the limits of non-violence, and

your victory may also mean the achievement of *swaraj*.

VIII

Lord Reading would bring to his task in India a clear mind and find a way out of the present situation. Lord Reading, it is now becoming increasingly clear, is surrendering himself more and more to Anglo-Indian counsels of reaction. His speech at Simla is an apology for the policy of repression! In an earlier speech, His Excellency said he wished "in preference to a memorial or statue or temple of fame" to leave behind him in India and in his own country a memory of work redounding to the welfare of India and the Empire". The policy of repression which is now at work will not, we may be sure, 'redound to the welfare' either of India or England. *The Times* of London, in a recent article, took the Government of India to task for "continuing to tolerate the subversive activities of the Khilafat agitation," and added: "There is a limit to toleration even in India and it appears to us that the limit has been reached!" Lord Reading's latest speech echoes

this reactionary view; His Excellency condemns the Khilafat agitation as having "the effect of disrupting the forces that make for order and of delivering the country into the hands of undisciplined mobs!" But have not the Khilafat leaders repeatedly urged that there should be non-violence? The message sent by every one of the Khilafat leaders, even after arrest, has been non-violence. The truth is that the Government finds the agitation very inconvenient and so has launched a policy of repression. The agitation *has* proved embarassing to Government; and I am amused to find Sir Surendranath speak of Non-co-operation as a 'dying cult'. The national movement *is* very inconvenient to the bureaucracy and *is* breaking down that god of government, *viz.*, prestige! The way, however, out of the difficulty is not repression, but whole-hearted co-operation with the nation.

His Excellency is anxious to point out that the prosecution of the Ali brothers is not an "attack upon the religion of Islam". A tolerant and democratic civilisation is, doubtless, essential to the very existence of the Empire. But that ideal is trampled

upon in the East. The ablest leaders of the Khilafat movement have been arrested. Yet we are asked to believe that Government has not directed an attack against the Khilafat cause! Lord Reading forgets that Islam is a political religion; and he cannot deny that the policy pursued by the Allies has practically shattered the temporal power of the Sultan-Khalifa. He hopes that "the Treaty of Peace might soon be concluded on reasonable terms satisfactory to Turkey and Indian Muslims". If such be, indeed, his 'fervent' hope, why prosecute the Ali Brothers and other leaders. The *Nation* wrote the other day: "Muslims put this broad case more simply. They call it a policy directed against Islam. That it is certainly not in intention, but it well may be so in effect. Until we find means to bring the Greek war to an end and revise the Treaty of Sevres, we must reckon on the probability of Muslim opposition to our rule in India in forms more organised and more dangerous than this Moplah outbreak."

Lord Reading is at considerable pains to show that Britain is not antagonistic to Islam. If Britain be friendly to Islam, why this trouble

over the Khilafat question? Who, what, stands in the way of a just solution? "There is no shadow of foundation," says His Excellency, "for the suggestions which have sometimes been made that Britain is helping Greece in some shape or form in her war with Turkey." But the semi-official French paper *Temps* in a recent issue admits that the Turco-Greek War is due, partly, to the 'indiscretion,' on the part of the Allied Powers in having "too precipitately allowed the Greeks, in fact, invited them to land troops at Smyrna!" Lord Reading defends the supply of munitions to Greece as being "in accordance with established international practice". His Excellency forgets that if Britain and Greece, which are both signatories to the Covenant of the League of Nations, complied with provisions of the Covenant, there would be no 'private manufacture of arms' for Greece in the allied countries. Mustafa Kamal, the Turkish nationalist leader, carrying on the war of defence against Greece, is *not* a member of the League of Nations. It is Great Britain and Greece which have broken the Covenant in the Turco-Greek War.

Can His Excellency deny that Britain is largely responsible for the Treaty of Sevres? And does not that Treaty abandon Smyrna to Greece? Does not every one know that the will of the inhabitants of Smyrna was not taken into consideration in promising away Smyrna to Greece? On whom, if not on Britain, rests a large measure of responsibility for the exhausting war in the Near East? As a continental paper, *The Independence* of Bucharest wrote: The Treaty of Sevres has proved "disastrous for everybody." What is needed is not a revision of the Treaty but repentence and renunciation of the policy which subordinates Turkey and the East to the imperialisms of the West.

"I am very conscious," says Lord Reading, "of the strength of Muslim feeling in India in all that affects the Khilafat and the Muslim religion." Why then these arrests of the Ali brothers and other leaders? The *Nation* also accused England of "excessive partisanship for inflated Greek claims". Yet Lord Reading would have us believe that "His Majesty's Government have adopted an attitude of strict neutrality" in the matter!

IX

The Viceroy's speech will carry conviction with no one who will take the trouble to look at the question from the Muslim point of view. "There is no room for intolerance in religious opinion," says His Excellency. Yet what does the Khilafat agitation in India aim at except to assert what Muslims regard as their religious rights and religious opinion? A big issue has been opened up, that of religious freedom, in a country which is the most sensitive in regard to matters religious. The Quran says in clear explicit terms: "Whoso killeth a believer purposely, his reward is hell." And if there be conflict between the Penal Code and the Koran, it is easy to understand what view the orthodox Muslim will take. Could Government, from *its* point of view, commit a bigger blunder than to make 'religion' the battle-ground of conflict between itself and the country?

X

Repression continues unchecked. It is time for us Hindus and Muslims in Sind to unite.

We must unite in the great struggle for freedom. We have common interests and some common traditions. Islam has made contribution to the life of India, and the Prophet of Islam has a message which the Hindus should understand and appreciate. Nor should the Muslim be slow to appreciate the culture and civilisation of Aryavarta and the beauty and wisdom enshrined in the teachings of India's sages and prophets. Old rivalries are over. The visions of the poets, saints and heroes of Hinduism and Islam are our common heritage. And we all have a desire to see India hold high her head among the world's true nations. Her unity will be the greatest guarantee of *swaraj*.

The Moplah outbreak is a terrible tragedy. Critics have now the excuse to exclaim—"Hindus! don't help the Muslims in the Khilafat cause!!" They entirely forget that Muslim leaders are not lukewarm in their sympathy with the Hindus. It is *their* attitude which counts. Hindu-Muslim unity must be a very fragile thing if it breaks under the strain of the deplorable Moplah outbreak. It will not break up if it be something more than *political*

unity. It should be a *union of hearts*. Once the union is made nothing can unmake the national cause for the union of hearts is indestructible.

A MUSLIM EMPIRE BUILDER

AKBAR—THE MAN AND HIS IDEALS

There is sorrow in the heart of Sind; her sons and daughters know her not. That her help was valued and sought in the Mahabharata War, that she had a share in checking Alexander's march in India, that once she had commerce with Rome and Greece and Assyria and Babylonia and Egypt, that she sent out her sons to colonise Java, that Buddha and Nanak blessed her by their worship and personal teaching at the Sindhu's bank, that her doctors and men of culture influenced the Khalif's court and the Arabs who carried the torch of culture to mediæval universities in Europe—all this and more, the modern sons of Sind have not cared to know. There is need of a Sindhi Historical Society; there is need of study-circles in Sindhi history. Such a society, such study-circles, will teach the young men to know better their past and to love the Sindhudesha. For history

is even as a long procession. In a procession, each one leaves his house, his little lane or quarter, and meets others, no matter what their creed or caste; and all move on to a common destination; in a procession, Hindus and Muslims and Parsis and Christians mingle as brethren, comrades in a common cause. In the long procession of history we all are brethren, and the leaders of the procession are our heroes, no matter what their community or creed. One of such leaders was Akbar.

The Muslim historian, Ferishta, gives a graphic account of the circumstances of Akbar's birth in Sind. Humayun is defeated at Kanouj by Sher Shah the Pathan; he is driven to Agra, thence to Lahore; he plunges into the Rajputana desert; he is pursued by Rajput troops; about one hundred miles away from Tatta—famous once as a centre of Asia's commerce with the West—is Umerkot; Humayun hurries to that place; his horse falls dead with fatigue on the way; some of his followers go mad for want of water; several die; only a few reach Umerkot; Sindhi peasants come and offer him water and their simple fare; (there is selfishness in our big cities, but in our villages the old

virtue of hospitality has persisted through the ages;) the Sindhi Raja of Umerkot—a Sodha—gives Humayun the rites of hospitality and makes him feel comfortable. Sind showed the qualities of a refined country in its treatment of the Moghul king in exile. At Umerkot on Sunday the 5th of Regib 949 of the Muslim era, Akbar is born to Hamida—a girl about fourteen years of age, and much loved by Humayun; Umerkot becomes the Amarkot; Akbar's birth has conferred on it immortality in the pages of history; and I have often said the people of Sind should raise a fund to erect at Umerkot a suitable monument to the memory of Akbar the Great.

I can only speak to you the truth as I understand it; and I will be forgiven if I say that there are certain aspects of Akbar's life and political creed which do not appeal to me. He believed in imperialism; I do not. An empire, in the current sense of that word, stands for domination; but the future is with federation on the basis of free nationalities. Akbar dreamt of building a vast empire; the Time-Spirit, wiser than he, shattered his dream. His imperialism led him to fight for years with the brave Rajputs; he should have respected the

Rajput nationality; instead, he carried into the heart of the Rajput country a sanguinary war, destroying palaces and temples and shrines of art; he cut off martial races with the sword; and I cannot condone his treatment of the brave Indian prince, Rana Pratap. A wonderful man—this Rana; he placed the honour of his house above comfort and ease; there was in him a soul of manhood; that soul scorned to submit to Akbar, and rose up in all the glory of suffering to protect Rajput liberty; his resources were small; he fought and failed; but there are moral causes for which it is better to fight and fail than not to fight at all; and the heroic life of this Rana is still sung in valleys and villages by the bards who shed tears as they sing of how he fought at Haldighat, the Rajput Thermopylæ—how he fought and beat the Moghul back—how, later, the Moghul overpowered him by sheer force of numbers—how he wandered from place to place riding his blue horse, summoning his people from hills and mounts to face the foe, how his family suffered, being pursued by the Moghul till saved by the Bhils who carried them in baskets of straw—how his children cried for

bread and the heart of this hero of many battles trembled—how at last the brave Rana died in a hut, defeated yet glorious in his love and loyalty to the Rajput race. Akbar's imperialism did not tolerate the Rajput nationality.

Akbar did not, like Asoka, believe in the 'conquest of *dharma*'; Akbar did not, like Rama, realise the value of *tapasya* for a king; but how many rulers of men have done so? Judged by the standards of the sixteenth century, Akbar was a man in advance of his age; and one cannot deny him the rich tribute due to a genius of a high order. Unlettered like Sivaji and Ranjit, he yet showed a mind capable of grasping great questions of science and statecraft; he invented a cannon which could be taken more easily on the march and put up quickly; he invented a millcart which served as a mill and could also carry weight; he organised an expedition to search the sources of the Ganges; he loved poetry and was one of the best musicians of his day; he was against animal sacrifices and the *suttee* of widows; he established the *Ibadad Khana*, and called conferences of religion for a comparative study of the world's great religions. I regard him as

superior to Cæsar and Alexander and Charlegmane and Constantine; he was not a saint, like Alfred, like Asoka, like Rama; but he was a statesman of a very high order. European historians admit that he was superior to his contemporaries; he was superior to Elizabeth at once in private character and public virtues; I believe India under him stood on a higher pinnacle of civilization than Europe did in those days; India, then, was honoured and Elizabeth sought Akbar's friendship.

At a time when Europe still believed in the 'divine right of kings,' Akbar glimpsed the beauty of a new idea of kingship; he understood that the king should be a leader of the people and, therefore, should co-operate with the best elements in the life of the country. What greater tragedy than when a government snubs or fights against the forces of a nation? Akbar desired to be the leader of a united India. You will remember that Seeley develops in his beautiful book, *The Expansion of England*, the idea that the bonds of union in a country are race, language, and religion; and it is often argued by India's critics that all talk of an Indian nationality is absurd, as India's

peoples have not a common race, a common language, and a common religion. But are these three *essential* to nation-building? In the United States there were as many as eighteen different languages in 1759; and even at present the Presidential election campaign pamphlets are published in twelve or thirteen languages; the language difficulty exists in Belgium and Switzerland; so the difficulty of religious differences exists in several countries in Europe; some are Protestant, some Catholic in faith; some, indeed, like France are frankly secular and confess no religious creed; and is not the English nation made up of diverse races? The bonds of union among a people in modern times are not those Seeley enumerated but (1) a common economic interest, (2) a common political life, and (3) a community of sentiments. A common economic interest—therefore, we have asked for economic freedom; therefore have I asked young men in different parts to take the *swadeshi* vow, and get homespun things. Denying themselves the luxury of foreign manufactures, they will be helpers of India. A common political life—therefore we have asked for the Indianising of the administration. A community of sentiment;—

therefore do we celebrate India's heroes no matter what their religion and race; therefore do we adore India as the Mother of all—Hindus and Muslims and Parsis and Christians. Let but the sentiment grow that we all are one—comrades in the one service, and India will be a great nation. Akbar put forth efforts to bring Hindus and Muslims together. Akbar's was a policy of assimilation, of co-operation with the people.

His life sends us the message of association; it is the message we need at this hour of our need. The first thing I was impressed with on my visit to Europe, years ago, was this: They in the West know how to associate one with the other for a common object. We here have, doubtless, virtues of our own; but association is not one of them; dissociation, lovelessness mar our work; our groups become cliques; intrigues and gossip infect our public life when it needs the sunshine of open, frank criticism to make it healthy and strong. I summon all Indians to get together in the one service of the nation. Fellow-countrymen of Sind! you are one another's; when will you seek each other, find each other and unite to make

Sind mighty again? Unite—and you will get what you want; unite—and you will achieve great things in the coming days. It is the hymn of a united people I ask the young men to listen to in their hearts to-day; and listening to the hymn, to prepare to walk in the path of service. Not easy that path; patriotism is not the quest of personal power and popularity; patriotism means *tapasya*, *tyaga*; it means self-denial and silent suffering. I have referred to the great Rajput hero—Rana Pratap. It was in a little lonely hut this patriot passed away; a few faithful followers were by his death-bed; he lingered on from day to-day; there was sorrow in his heart. 'Why this sorrow?' they asked him. 'I long for a pledge from you,' he said, 'that you will not indulge in ease nor live in houses better than these huts till the Rajput has regained his glory: ease and luxury will be the death of my people.' They gave the pledge, and the great hero passed away. To the young men I bring this day this message of *tapasya*. Abandon thoughts of ease and luxury, of power and popularity. Men of riches and titles will not help the land. Men who will be ready to

walk the rough path are needed. Asking nought from the glittering world of fashion, and giving only love to all they meet, their labours will be blessed with a rich fruitage by the Great Ones who stand behind us in the struggle of to-day.

A MOCKERY OF INTERNATIONAL MORALITY

The behaviour of the Great Powers towards Turkey ever since the armistice has been a mockery of 'international morality'. On the very day the Peace Treaty was signed there was signed an agreement between England, France and Italy. The object of the agreement was that the three powers were to help one another in "maintaining the sphere of influence in Turkey"! And the agreement signed in secret was not made public till three months after it was signed! The New York *Times* explained in brief the import of that secret agreement. "The division of the remnant of Turkey into spheres of British, French and Italian economic influence," wrote that paper, "is in a way a frank partition of the spoils of war in regions where self-determination, if it could be worked at all in the case of the Turks, would give little support to a scheme like this. In what is left

to France, there is considerable mineral wealth. Italy will get the valuable coal mines of Heraclea which the Italians need. British, French and Italian diplomats are going about it in the only way they know. Doubtless there is great wealth awaiting development. The partitioning of Turkey under the terms of the treaty signed by Great Britain, France and Italy on August 10 is an agreement quite in the old manner. There are spheres of influence, control of railway roads, exploitation of mines, diplomatic support by all to each and each to all the three Powers in maintaining their position—an ancient tale told exactly in the ancient way." I would express the conduct of the three big Powers to Turkey and Islam in a few words thus: surrender to exploitation and imperialism. The partition of Turkey is an international crime. The *Nation* criticised the Allies in a few frank words thus: "We have each pursued our own interest. We have bickered and bargained and betrayed. France and Italy have wrung large concessions in Anatolia; Britain has countered by exalting Greece into an empire. Syria and Palestine as well as Constantinople have been the happy hunting-grounds

of western intriguers. Everyone of the peoples of the Near and Middle East has been, in greater or less degree, the victim of our rivalries and our greeds." And these "rivalries and greeds" have meant war and devastation and massacres and stricken homes and piles of dead and acute political unrest in the unfortunate East!

What after all do the Turks and Muslims demand? The Turkish people want a recognition of their rights to govern in their way their own territories. The Muslims want an independent status for their Khalifa and a restoration to Muslim control of their Holy Places. Are the demands unfair? The rights of the Turkish people should be recognised by any nation that has any the least regard for the principle of self-determination. The Turks want a revision of the Treaty of Sevres. They want the possession of Anatolia. They want a *real* control of Constantinople. The Straits may well be internationalised but in an honest way. The Turks want Smyrna and Thrace which the Premier once called "the homeland of the Turkish race". Are the demands unfair? Is it unfair for the Turks to urge that they must govern themselves? And

are the orthodox Muslims unfair in demanding that their Khalifa should have the status of a dignified head of the Muslim world and that their Holy Places should not be controlled by any non-Muslim power?

Mr. Churchill said some time ago that "peace was the paramount object which we have been pursuing for months past". Who would believe this after the Turko-Greek War? It was the Supreme Council that bestowed upon Greece some regions belonging to Turkey in the East! The Turks are fighting to resist this aggrandisement of European powers. The struggle from the beginning has been, as I understand it, between Asia's rights and Europe's imperialism. In that imperialism is the greatest danger, I believe, to international peace and understanding.

TOGETHER WE RISE OR TOGETHER WE FALL

INDIA has been inhabited by different races. Differences, in a sense, make harmony. But when we forget *dharma*, every blessing becomes a burden. When India forgot her *dharma*, her vision of humanity, when millions of her children were despised as the "depressed class," she lost her strength. When Hindus and Muslims quarrelled with one another, our national unity was sundered. We are trying to recover it to-day. Hence the spread of a new feeling for the "untouchables"; hence the cry of "Hindu-Muslim unity".

The cry has made many of India's critics uneasy. In the "Empire" supplement to *The Times* (London), a writer speaks of Hindus and Muslims as enemies. "Enemies," he observes, "they have been, are, and ever shall be!" It suits him to belittle the recent Hindu-Muslim compact. "Famous Maulvis," he says, "have

denounced as *kafirs* all those Muhammadans who acknowledge Gandhi as a Mahatma!" Who are those "famous Maulvis"? The writer in *The Times* does not like the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity. "It is a well-known fact," he says, "that at their religious festivals, certain Hindu tribes have been in the habit of sacrificing two goats, one white and the other black, the white representing the British and the black the Muhammadan"!! This, again, is news to me. I can understand such a thing having been done several years ago when feelings were running high on account of the Government's efforts to separate Hindus and Muslims by the partition of Bengal. But I cannot believe that such a thing has been done by any known or influential "Hindu tribes" in recent days. That the writer in *The Times* labours under serious misconceptions is indicated by his next observation that "the Hindus are endeavouring to bring the Muhammadans into subjection in the matter of cow-killing—an uncompromising subjection; for there is no hint of forgoing any Hindu right, by way of preserving the balance"! Surely, to ask Muslims to help Hindus in the matter of preventing cow-slaughter is not to

"bring the Muslims into subjection". "Khilafat! Swaraj! These are high-sounding words," the writer remarks, "wherewith the Hindu agitator seduces uneducated Muhammadans"!! Are the Ali brothers and their numerous co-workers, "Hindu agitators"? And what can be more unfair to Indian Muslims than to suggest, as does the writer in *The Times*, that what disturbs their minds is "not the fate of the holy places" but "the more personal matters of their *ruthbla* (status) in India, and daily bread"?

The truth is, attempts to draw Hindus and Muslims closer together in the service of India or Islam disturb the critics of Indian nationalism. Their one argument against our claims to self-government is that India is not a nation. But if you admit that Hindus and Muslims *are* united, this talk of India not being a nation must be given up! A Major-General in the British Army, writing in the *Outlook* of New York on the Indian situation, says: "Any Indian who talks of the Indian *nation* knows that he is talking nonsense, for the benefit of a gullible and ignorant foreigner"!! When asked why he does not regard India as a nation,

the Major-General says: "Dissimilarity of castes and races"!! It is true Europe has an advantage here; Europe has peoples who are practically of one race; India is inhabited by different races. What is essential, however, to nation-building is not a common racial origin but a common national sentiment. And to know the India of to-day is to know that a common national sentiment is sweeping over the country. "If there were an Indian nation, 300 millions strong, genuinely determined to be free, no power on earth could hinder her freedom." So wrote that frank opponent of Indian nationalism—Mr. Frank Beaman. "*If* there were an Indian nation"! Such a nation *is* evolving to-day; and the resolve to be free is growing. The faith is spreading to-day from town to town that India must achieve *swaraj* at an early date. An essential element in that faith, as I understand it, is Hindu-Muslim unity.

The idea of Hindu-Muslim unity, in its deeper religious significance, was preached by the great founder of the Sikh faith—Guru Nanak. As students of his life know, he went to Mecca—a holy place of Islam;—and when

asked if he was a Hindu or a Muslim he said: "Neither a Hindu nor a Mussalman". He could have said: *Both* a Hindu and a Mussalman. Guru Nanak wished Hindus and Muslims to regard themselves as members of a common family. The idea of Hindu-Muslim unity in its political application comes historically later. With whom did it originate? With an eminent Sindhi—with him who was born to Humayun when the latter came to Sind crossing the great desert after losing his throne of Delhi. Was not Akbar a Sindhi? A tradition has it that Akbar often sat on a slab of stone, thinking, dreaming! Of what? Of a Great India, a United India, a Hindu-Muslim India. Akbar tried to make Muslims and Hindus associates in the service of India. And his example influenced later days. Ranjitsingh had a Muslim commander. The Nizam had a Hindu minister.

In several villages in Sind even to-day, Hindu-Muslim unity is not an idea but a daily experience. I have seen Hindus offering syrup to Muslims in the Mohurrum days. Hindus and Muslims together pay homage at the shrine of a Sindhi saint—Lal Shahbeiz. I

have seen them sitting together in the evening singing or listening to *Sufi* songs. And Hindus no less than Muslims acclaim our great poet—Shah Latif—as the king of their hearts.

Hindu-Muslim unity has been disturbed during the British rule of India. The short-sighted stranger often thinks it pays to play off one community against another. The National Congress did not, for several years, get Muslim sympathy. The bureaucracy were glad the Muslims were not with the Hindus in the 'agitation'. "It was the Hindu," remarked a writer in *The Times*, "who started the poisonous anti-British movement known as the Indian National Congress. For a long time the Muhammadan masses refused to lend their support to a league whose ultimate aim was the overthrow of British rule in India!" About twenty years after the Congress, the Muslim League was formed—it is believed under official instigation. The league was formed on the occasion of the King's visit to Aligarh. The King was then the Prince of Wales. One of the three objects of the League was to develop "pride in the glorious Empire"! India had not then, has not now, many Englishmen like

Mr. Bethune who loved India and who in his last will left a substantial amount for the girls' school now developed into the college worthily associated with his name in Calcutta. Not many Englishmen like Mr. Bethune have served India. The majority of them have supported a policy which has pitted Hindus against Muslims and the masses against the "politically-minded classes". Sir Michael O'Dwyer approved of Dyer's action at Jallianwalla—yet wrote the other day of the Indian masses being entitled to protection at British hands against Indian politicians! And soon after the Muslim League was formed, Lord Curzon launched his scheme of partition of Bengal. It was meant to be a partition of Hindus and Mussalmans. "It is the Babu," wrote Sir J. D. Rees, "who controls the Indian press which invented *swadeshi* and the *swaraj*." And the 'Babu' must be partitioned off from the "loyal" Mussalman! In the Barisal riots, Muslims were let off, Hindus were punished. And we have not yet forgotten Sir A. Frazer's phrase about the Muslim being the "favourite wife" of the *sircar*! Then came the Minto-Morley Reforms.

The "Reforms" were infected with partiality to the Muslim. Muhammadans were given "privileges".

Awakening came under the grace of the Saviour of the nations. Lord Curzon was played out. A *unity-consciousness* essential to nation's life began to develop. There are clever Englishmen, to-day, who say that the Indian National movement is a creation of British rule! The movement is a creation of the Indian genius to guard itself against an 'efficient,' unimaginative bureaucracy. "Indian nationalism," said Lord Lytton, "was not only foreseen by British rulers in India but was definitely created by them!" "The goal of Indian nationalism," he added, "has from the first been the goal of British rule in India!" Who will believe this in the face of the Government's policy of repression? Our goal is *swaraj*, and if repression leads us to the goal, it does so only as an opponent's challenge draws out the best and noblest in us.

The awakening came as the result of several causes. Indian Muslims have a robust common-sense. They came to realise that a self-respecting community must not ask for 'privileges'.

They came to realise that in co-operation with each other was the strength of the Hindu and Muslim communities. They came to realise that the bureaucracy patronised them to serve its own purpose, and in the Aligarh College controversy they came in conflict with Lord Curzon; he wanted, Aligarh protested against, high fees and the restricting of the number of pupils. Some talented Muslims, indeed—men like Tyabji, Sayani, Syed Ameer Ali—had expressed sympathy with the Congress, and the Muslim League did not take long to appreciate the national ideal. Syed Ameer Ali, speaking in London as President of the British branch of the Muslim League, said: "The object of the league is the creation of a united India"; and Muslims recalled what their eminent leader, Sir Syed Ahmed, had said years ago: "In the word 'nation' I include both Hindus and Muhammadans." The national sentiment had been strengthened, too, by the news of Japan's victory over Russia. Not many of the younger generation realise to-day the value of that victory to the national movement in India. It was a victory which created a profound impression upon the world.

Nogi, the national hero of Japan, received in his mud house, telegrams of congratulation from different quarters, one of them being a cable from the Kaiser! With beautiful modesty characteristic of the great men of the East, the hero of Port Arthur—revered as a demi-god in Japan—received the honours showered upon him. On the victory day he was sitting alone in his house; a dimly lighted lamp was burning; tears were on his cheeks; others thought of the victory, *he* thought of the men killed in the conflict. "It has cost us dear," he said. But the victory awakened a new national consciousness in the East; the victory, as an eminent Japanese said, "destroyed the hypnotism of colour". India rejoiced at the victory. Its message for her was twofold: Union and Freedom. Japan had defeated the great Czar of all the Russias; why could not India defeat the bureaucracy and achieve freedom? But Japan could not have won if Japan had not been *united* in her struggle against Russia. The lesson was clear: Freedom cannot be won without union. And the Nation's union meant Hindu-Muslim unity. The idea began to be a moving force. Some years later, Hindu and Muslim leaders entered

at Lucknow into a compact to stand together in the struggle for freedom.

Then came the Punjab tragedy. Acts of Sir Michael's administration during that dark period in our history have been compared, as Indian members of the Hunter Committee confessed, to "the acts of frightfulness committed by some of the German military commanders during the war in Belgium and France". I believe the martial law atrocities in the Punjab were *worse* than those committed by the German military commanders. No German commander inflicted a "crawling order" upon a Belgian; and when Cardinal Mercier asked the German Governor of Belgium to guarantee in writing that young men at Antwerp would not be carried by force to Germany, the latter immediately issued a written declaration: "Young men need have no fear that they will be taken to Germany either to be enrolled in the army or to be employed there in forced labour." The deportation of Belgians into Germany for forced labour or work behind the lines was the most cruel of German atrocities in Belgium. But the 'crawling order' of the martial law

administration in the Punjab was *worse*! And no German general in Belgium fired, as General Dyer did at Jallianwalla Bag, upon an unarmed crowd who had no intention to fight. At Jallianwalla Bag many Hindus and Muslims were shot to death. The tragedy proved to be a judgment of history upon bureaucratic rule in India; and the tragedy made Hindus and Muslims realise their unity as comrades in the one struggle for freedom.

The injustice inflicted on Islam after the War served also to draw Muslims and Hindus closer in a common protest against Government. The blundering of British politicians was not, has not yet been, repaired. No heed was paid to the demand that the Premier must not break his pledge to the Muslims; Turkey was partitioned; the Khilafat movement became a national movement. So in the hour of Islam's great sorrow was born the fine spirit of comradeship between Hindus and Muslims. To-day, the Khilafat question is become a national one, an Indian question; to-day many Indians stand by the Muslims saying: Your sorrow is ours; your cause is ours; together we rise or together we fall. To-day,

thank God, Hindu-Muslim unity is a growing force.

What is there which India cannot achieve—*if* this Unity is maintained and becomes stronger even than it is to-day? What is there which the solidarity of twenty-two crores of Hindus and seven crores of Muslims enjoying the sympathy of forty crores of Muslims ouside India should find it impossible to accomplish? Sir Valentine Chirol speaks of the "incongruous alliance of Mr. Gandhi with the brothers, Shaukat and Mahomed Ali"! Hindu-Muslim unity is *not* 'incongruous'; it is as natural as it is essential to India's freedom, to the freedom of the East. How many realise that it is Hindus who hold in their hands the very destiny of the Empire? The Indian administration is carried on with the conscious or unconscious co-operation of the Indians. And beyond India, again, Indians have done much, are doing much for the Empire. It was Indian soldiers who saved the Allies' cause in Belgium. It was Indian divisions who turned the scale in Palestine. It was Indian troops who took Mesopotamia for England. It is Indian crews who maintain the Persian Gulf. If India's

millions, Muslims and Hindus, resolve: "We shall not co-operate with the Empire except on terms of equality and justice—our own terms"—they can make India free and Islam free. What power, I ask, can long resist the resolve of the millions of Hindus and Muslims united in the one service of freedom? The bureaucracy still hopes that forces of disruption will set in and tear the Hindu and the Muslim apart. Sir Valentine Chirol still talks of "the hereditary prejudices of rival castes amongst the Hindus," or "the still more bitter antagonism of the Muhammadan and the Hindu masses". Once Britain realises that Hindu-Muslim unity is unbreakable, Government will, I believe, come to terms with India and Islam.

I believe in the vital values of Islam; I believe that Islam has a place in the evolution of humanity. I believe that a living, vital Islam will do good to modern civilisation. Hindu-Muslim unity can save Islam. And in saving itself, Islam may also help in saving modern civilisation. Once Islam nourished the life of Europe; once Islam kept alive the torch of science and culture in Europe. Once again Islam may help Europe. For to-day

Europe is dominated by mammon; Islam with its faith in Allah, its witness to the Kingdom of God, is a protest against the evils of capitalism. India and Islam, I have often felt, may enable Europe to recover her soul. For Europe's civilisation has in it the power of the machine; it has but little of the power of the Spirit—the power of Allah the Compassionate. And in Hindu-Muslim unity is the hope of the coming of a day when Islam may be vindicated.

Not in smooth words but in action should this unity be expressed. We can unite in the national agitation for the three demands of the Congress. We can unite in social service. What prevents Hindu and Muslim volunteers from working together to give relief on occasions of famine, floods, cholera and other epidemics? What prevents Hindus and Muslims from working together to improve the condition of peasants, to appoint joint arbitration boards, to settle disputes, to revive the weaver's art, to help the *swadeshi*, to build up national schools, to prevent cow-slaughter? Critics talk of differences between the Hindu and the Muslim? But differences are not discords. Nitrogen and oxygen combine

to produce air which is indispensable to life. Co-operation between Hindus and Muslims will produce the air of national freedom. One of the noblest forms of action is suffering for a noble cause. Common suffering strengthens union.

When I first expressed sympathy with the Khilafat movement, friends came to me and said: What are you doing? You can gain nothing; you will only incur anger of the *sircar*. And I said to them: life's strength is not in gain but in loss, not in what we get but what we give. Since that day, several young men in Sind—Hindus and Muslims—have gone to jail. And I have often asked myself: Is their sacrifice poured out in vain? Do their sufferings bear no message to us? There has been in my heart the dream of that greater time when, gathering moral strength, young men will vindicate the Mother. That greater time is coming, I trust, in the crisis of these days. Therefore do I ask Hindus and Muslims to stand together. To keep Hindus and Muslims apart would be to defeat the *swaraj* movement. It would be to play into the hands of the bureaucracy. I say to as many Hindus and

Muslims as my words may reach: Stand together. Stand together—but not in anger. Stand together—but not in pride. In humility and non-violence will be our strength. I write this on the day when the eminent Muslim leaders —Ali brothers, Dr. Kitchlew and four respected Muslim religious heads, have been sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment each. Feelings at this hour are running high. Several of my country men are losing faith to-day in non-violence. Several wish for violence, talk of violence. Passion and hate have, I confess, entered into the movement of Non-co-operation, as it works in some places. There is agony in my heart at the thought that vibrations of violence are multiplying. And so in all humility I submit that Hindus and Muslims must stand together—not in hate or strife but in the wisdom of non-violence. For violence means disruption; violence means assault upon Hindu-Muslim solidarity; violence means throwing India into civil strife and squalid intrigues. Violence means betrayal of India's pledge to humanity. Some of my friends say: With violence we shall achieve *swaraj*. Are you sure, I ask? Are you sure we shall not fall into the hands of

some military dictators who may trample upon freedom more ruthlessly than even the bureaucracy? But even if you are able to achieve *swaraj* with violence, let me ask.—Is *swaraj* the absolute end of India's life? What shall it profit India to gain *swaraj* if she lose her own soul? What do we achieve if we secure *swaraj* by violence but mar the purpose of the 'Logos' of India's evolution? For with violence India becomes like other nations—a mortal among mortals. But my dream is of an India young and immortal—a *guru*, a spiritual teacher, a healer of the nations. The history of freedom has in other countries been a story of strife. Passion has fought with privilege. But I believe that in this land of Buddhas and Rishis and idealists and of Him the great Avatar of Love—in India we can achieve freedom *without* violence. I believe *ahimsa* has stupendous possibilities as an agency of national emancipation and international fellowship. Only let us—the Hindus and Muslims and Parsis and Christians of India—stand together with clean hearts in the struggle of to-day. In solidarity or this moral character will be, I believe, our real strength. I believe that our unity and

sacrifice will win India's freedom. I believe that India's soul will emerge strong from the struggle. And it is my hope that with this spirit of non-violence, with this faith in *ahimsa*, India will write the opening chapter of the world's new history of freedom.

WILL REPRESSION WORK?

SOME of the comments in England on the situation in India indicate how little England realises the character of our struggle and its possibilities. *The New Statesman*, while apparently in sympathy with the Government's policy, has just a little glimpse of the growing situation in this country. Commenting on Lord Reading's defence of the prosecution of the Khilafat leaders and his view of Muslim grievances, that paper says: "Lord Reading's tone is unusually good, but the current news is of so dark a hue that his words seem to have little touch with the actualities of the hour." If, indeed, Lord Reading had been in vital touch with the actualities of the situation, he would not have sanctioned prosecution of the Muslim leaders on a charge of conspiracy. On the main charge, indeed, the jury declared the accused not guilty! The Government case collapsed! Say, if you will, that the Muslim

leaders were spreading disaffection, but to call them conspirators was to do gross injustice to men who are frank almost to a fault. Say, if you will, that the movement has not secured the support of many intellectuals, or that there is too much of the 'feeling element' in it. But nothing could be further from the truth than to accuse the Muslim leaders of being engaged in a 'conspiracy'. The Ali brothers spoke frankly of their *conditional* loyalty; they said violence was permitted by Islam, but they made it clear they had given their word that they would *not* depart from non-violence as long, at any rate, as they were associated with Mahatma Gandhi; and those who know them know that the Ali brothers' word is a word of honour. Dr. Kitchlew, in his able address to the jury, spoke of himself as a 'revolutionary'; but he, too, made it clear that it was a non-violent revolution he wanted. Such men will do things boldly; they will not adopt secret methods; they will not be 'conspirators'; they will not 'seduce' government servants; and, as *The New Statesman* is careful to note, Mr. Mahomed Ali argued in the Karachi trial that "the charges touching the seducing of

troops were trumped up by the Government when they realised how far Non-co-operation had become a crusade in the Muslim community".

"One serious sequel to the Moplah rising," wrote *The New Statesman*, "is the annoncement of the impending arrest of Mr. Mahomed Ali and his brother, the leaders of the Khilafat movement in India and undoubtedly at present the most energetic disturbers of the peace!" When did the Ali Brothers 'disturb the peace'? When actually arrested, did not both the brothers send to their countrymen messages of non-violence? Is it not rather the policy of the Government which disturbs calm and quiet and produces irritation and excitement almost every day? According to *The New Statesman* "it remains for the British mind a dark puzzle how such men as the Alis and their associates in the Caliphate movement have been able to make common cause with the unique apostle of non-violent non-co-operation". It is not a 'dark puzzle' to the Muslims, who claim that non-co-operation is not a new weapon, but an old one used at one stage by the Prophet of Islam. *The Nation* says: "It is the fatality of our

rule in India that in times of crisis and opportunity the executive policy should always bear a dual aspect. Lord Reading's action in regard to the Rowlatt Act is being weighed by all India against the arrest and prosecution of the brothers, Mahomed Ali and Shaukat Ali. In other words, a step towards constitutional regularity goes with an assertion of executive authority; and those who cling to the hope of still finding a way out by means of a steady liberalising of the administration, find themselves driven to confess that their hope is only of a desperate kind." The hope is desperate because the Government pursues a policy of combining repression with concession. Such a combination cannot work. The way out is frankly to abandon repression and to come to terms with the people.

But neither the bureaucracy nor the British press is in a mood yet to understand the character of the national movement in India. Both continue to delude Britain. The British public have not yet realised that the challenge given for men like Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali brothers must be met with sympathy, not repression.

The Times goes the length of imputing some sordid motives to the Ali brothers! *The Times* did not hesitate to attribute low motives even to Mahatma Gandhi, and suggested that Gandhi's preaching of non-violence was camouflage! And I am not surprised to find *The Times* damn the Ali brothers as unscrupulous agitators! So damned *The Times* some of the great Irish patriots in the earlier phase of the Irish struggle. History will salute the Ali brothers, Dr. Kitchlew, Pir Mujadid and the three other Muslim divines as men made in the martyr mould—men who were loyal to the light in them and who went with bold, firm steps to the Central Jail to vindicate the claims of Islam.

A writer in *The Daily Mail* denounces the Ali brothers as "two notorious Indian firebrands"! He knows them personally, he says. He could not abuse them, if he knew them. To know the Ali brothers is to love them, to admire them—even where one differs from them in certain matters. "The Ali brothers," the writer in *The Daily Mail* remarks, are "irreconcilable Pan-Islamists." What if they are? I ask. Pan-Islamism need frighten no nationalist. Once we believe in Hindu-Muslim unity, we

realise that the strength of Islam is India's strength and *vice versa.* "Their one demand," the writer continues, "and only demand is: 'India for the Mahomedans'." This is a misreading of Pan-Islamism and a misrepresentation of the ideals of the Ali brothers. In their addresses to the jury, the brothers made it clear that they wanted *swaraj* for India, and by *swaraj* they want not Muslim *swaraj*, not Hindu *swaraj* but democratic *swaraj*. Not India for the Muslims but India for the Indians—such is the ideal of the Ali brothers, as, indeed, it is of Hindu nationalists too. And the brave brothers have struggled not for Muslim domination but for Muslim religious liberty. For their fearless advocacy of the claims of Islam they suffer to-day in the Central Jail. Their sufferings will give added strength to Hindu-Muslim unity and the Indian struggle for freedom. But on this condition—that the national movement is used by us in the service of Love. The positive, constructive aspects of the movement with special reference to education, *swadeshi*, simple life, fellowship with the poor, need to be emphasised. The purpose of the renewed policy of repression is to maintain the *sircar's* prestige

to show that the Government has power. The cult of power and repression go together. Government rests on prestige; but a civilised government would wish to earn prestige by doing justice to the people's demand; the Indian Government is unable to *earn* it, and so is anxious to have it by force. Repression is a form of force. Submit, or be incarcerated—such is the logic of a power-intoxicated bureaucracy. It cannot be denied that the *sircar's* prestige has suffered on account of the rapid progress of the *swarajya* sentiment. Is it any wonder that the bureaucracy, impelled by an instinct of self-preservation, wishes to withdraw as many leaders of the *swaraj* movement as it can. Commenting on the recent tours of Mahatama Gandhi and the Ali brothers, *The Daily Telegraph* wrote: "The visits of Mahomed Ali and Gandhi might have been prohibited; and the fact that these notorious insurrectionaries were allowed to deliver treasonable threats in public may well have confirmed the opinion that the Government was afraid of them. This is an impression which is destructive of all order and confidence among an Oriental people." As though democracy was alien to Oriental consciousness and

freedom to criticise the Government was not a right of every civilised nation! "There is some reason to suspect," adds the *Telegraph*, "that our consideration for influential apostles of revolution has been misinterpreted, and that strong measures may be needed to restore that unquestioned prestige of the administration on which the tranquillity of an Asiatic society depends." "Unquestioned prestige" was never earned; and strong measures do not secure it for long. For there is a divinity among men that protests against power trampling upon truth and justice.

Anglo-Indian papers have received the news of the Karachi sentences with relief. The Ali brothers are now clapped in jail! Will the movement languish? The Government thinks so. Anglo-Indian critics think so. Reactionaries in England think so. Repression checked the national movement led by Arabindo Ghose. But only for a time. The spirit of the people languished for a while, then rose again. Will repression, this time, check the *swaraj* movement? The future is on the lap of the gods. Our karma will be our destiny. I believe the country will be able to achieve freedom

through repression. I believe the soul of India will not be killed by repression or coercion. It may be the will of God that India will be crucified. But after crucification comes ascension. And India, I believe, will rise again in power and glory.

Some there are who think the situation will quickly improve: the Prince is coming, they say. But what can the Prince do for us? No sensible Indian can have anything to say against his Royal Highness; he has done us no harm; he comes, I believe, with good-will for India. But he does not realise the character and urgency of the Indian demand; and the bureaucracy will utilise his visit in the interests of political conservatism. And what force can the Prince's pronouncements have with officers who are not responsible to the people? We know how Lord Curzon interpreted the Queen's Proclamation. We saw at the Khalikdina Hall what regard the learned judge showed for the proclamations of three successive sovereigns! We know how often British statesmen have spoken of the principle of 'equality in the Empire'; yet when it is a question of Indians in Africa, a statesman of Mr. Churchill's standing

12 g

calmly says the principle of equality "has to be very carefully and gradually applied, because intense local feelings are excited, and there is no doubt that extraordinary social stresses arise when populations are intimately mingled in some of these new countries and brought into severe economic competition"!! India's voice is not respected.

What are we to do?—is the question asked by many. I ask all friends of the national cause to push on the *swadeshi* campaign and not lose faith in the future of freedom. I say this believing that repression will become more and more rigorous. Sind has sent over fifty men to jail; more will, I believe, be jailed by the bureaucracy under one excuse or another —and earlier, it may be, than many may expect. Repression will continue, and, personally, I do not expect the struggle to be over in two months. I believe the bureaucracy will not surrender so soon. There is little sign of its shaking off its power-intoxication. But we must work on without losing faith in freedom. We must check the forces of demoralisation. The cause will be helped by honest thinking, humility, patience,

self-discipline, sincerity, solidarity. The heavy sentence passed upon the Muslim leaders should draw out the noblest of our impulses for making *swadeshi* a success and for strengthening the Hindu-Muslim unity which is, to my mind, the greatest guarantee of our future.

Printed by J. R. Aria at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras.